THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XIII JULY, 1926 No. 73

EDITORIAL

The Church Assembly will have before it in its forthcoming session one of the most important reports which it has as yet been asked to receive, that of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission.* The distinguished and representative character of the members of the Commission would alone have entitled its findings to respect; but when to this is added a substantial unanimity as to what ought to be done, it is clear that the document is very impressive indeed. We commend the report to the serious consideration of our readers. The recommendations seem to us to have certain outstanding merits, such as the definite place in the system assigned to theologians, the constitution of a final "Court of Appeal to the Crown" which will enlist the services of the highest legal authorities in the land, and the provisions of various kinds for ensuring that the system will be elastic enough for the living organism which it is to serve. Among the brief "Notes and Reservations" which conclude the report, that of Dr. Darwell Stone undoubtedly represents a widespread body of opinion in the Church; and in one way or another his second point at least will have to be met if the proposals are to be generally accepted as just and equal. The old question, "Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?" is one which there is good authority both for asking and for answering.

We must not, however, dwell at this point on any matters of detail. The report embodies a great weight of wisdom, learning, and devotion to the Church. It comes at an opportune moment, when in civil no less than in ecclesiastical affairs old liberties have been abused and new forms of order and corporate life are being thought out. As the report says, "A Church is in this respect in the same position as a nation. Indeed, the Church as organized within a nation ought to give to the nation a conspicuous example of the right correlation of law and liberty." These are words which carry a peculiar significance amid the tumult and disunion of our time. The English Church is still the salt of the English people: let us ensure that it keeps its savour.

* Church Assembly, and S.P.C.K. 8d net

THE VALUE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT*

During the nineteen centuries of Christian history there has been a recurring tendency, which has always proved to be heretical, to make little of the Old Testament. In the second century Marcion, who seems to have been one of the most forceful and intelligent of the great heretics who have been God's instrument for keeping the Church from sleep, asserted that the God of the Old Testament was the enemy of the true God. In the nineteenth century Julius Wellhausen, without exception the greatest and most philosophical of Old Testament critics, described the God of the early Hebrews as a storm-god who dwelt on the cloud-capped peak of Mount Sinai, and who fought before His people, discomfiting their enemies with thunder and lightning and hailstones, as can be read in the First Book of Samuel and elsewhere; and then he puts the pointed question, Is this God the same as the Father of Jesus Christ? It is not difficult to feel the full force of that contrast. The God who accepted Jephthah's sacrifice of his daughter, who commanded Saul to exterminate the Amalekites—men, women, children, and infants, and even their cattle and sheep—in punishment for an offence committed three hundred years before, whose commandment was "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth," is not easily recognized as the personalized ideal of the Christian life. There is a great gulf fixed between the book in which men have found justification for slavery, polygamy, and reprisals, and the religion which will not let us be content with less than "love your enemies" and pray for them, and forgive as you pray to be forgiven. The Old Testament has a conception of God that has been outgrown.

The first thing to be said about this contrast is that, in any such form as it is often stated, it is exaggerated. There is that in the Old Testament which proves that it is the Word of God because it never grows old; it abideth for ever. Take the Ten Commandments. In their simplest form they are very old, certainly more than three thousand years old. And it is possible to hear them with the ears of time who first heard them: "Offer the tribal worship in the appointed way, honour your ancestors, respect the property and the wife and the life of your fellow tribesman"—that is the whole duty of primitive man. But as culture and civilization advance, as the spirit of man becomes broader, deeper, more rich, as duty becomes more complicated, difficult to know, costly to perform, at every

* The first of three lectures delivered in St. Mary's Church, Beverley.

level it is possible to subsume the whole duty of man under these ten words, as the great Christian moralists have done, St. Augustine and those who came after him, as the office of Holy Communion did in that book of which so much that is severe is most deservedly said, the second Prayer Book of King Edward VI., as our Church Catechism does, as that great living Catholic moralist, Bishop Gore, has done. Now see what that means. When you find words that are not left behind as man climbs toward God, which are fitted always to carry richer, fuller meaning—to express new, higher, more spiritual ideals—well, that is what we mean when we say that the words are inspired. They come out of the heart of humanity, they have come out of the mouth of God.

Or consider another fact which you must forget if you distinguish too clearly and exactly the Old Testament from the New, the Jewish sacred books from those of Christianity. That fact is the Hebrew prophets, a miraculous succession of miraculous teachers. The word "miraculous" must be emphasized. In a recent most interesting book on *Excavations in Palestine*, Professor Macalister has made very vivid the contrast between the prophets and their environment. Digging in Palestine has made us realize, more than we could do before, the low and crude level of civilization on which the Hebrews lived. They were not only incomparably weaker than their neighbours in a military sense, they were poorer, less cultured, ignorant, barbarous. All the evidence shows that when they entered Palestine they lowered the standard of living, they brought down the level of achievement in all the industrial arts. They were uncivilized. And it is against that savage environment that we must estimate that unique succession of unique poets and preachers, men of God, whom we call the Hebrew Prophets. The record of their teaching is a possession for ever, the real thing, a permanent achievement of the human spirit, in its own way an abiding revelation of God. Men will always draw refreshment and inspiration and courage from them: from Amos, the herdsman who saw the vision of the righteousness of God; from Hosea, who wrung from the agony of his own broken heart the revelation of His love; from Isaiah of Jerusalem, who dared to tell in the king's court of the Holy God who should make Egypt and Assyria to be brethren with Judah; from Jeremiah, who stood against all the current of the life of his time, in Church and State, because God had spoken to him as a man speaks to his friend. But the time would fail me to tell of Habakkuk and Micah and Ezekiel, of the anonymous author of the tremendous drama of Job, of the unknown poet who sang of the Servant of the Lord. "Thus saith the Lord" was how these men began

their teaching, and humanity has only confirmed their estimate of themselves. It is no mark of insight to make little of the Old Testament.

The Old Testament, however, has a special and unique importance in relation to the Incarnation—to the revelation of God in and through the earthly life and teaching of Our Lord Jesus Christ. The great religious movement which came out of His life—what we call the "primitive Church"—was marked by a remarkable outburst of literary activity. Gospels, letters, homilies, accounts of services, "acts" of great saints and leaders; the amount and variety of the literature is wonderful. Now some of these writings the Christian community accepted; it put the seal of its approval on them, it found in them what it needed to instruct, to inspire, reprove. In course of time these books became "Scripture," they were recognized as "inspired," they are what we call the New Testament. The other early Christian writings fell into the background. Some of them have been lost for ever, some have been recovered by antiquaries. They are read by students who seek to understand the atmosphere and history of the first Christian centuries. Now, how can we sum up, in a phrase or so, the differences between the inspired Christian books—those that won their way into the New Testament—and those which were left outside? The most adequate and enlightening definition of the difference is this: the canonical books are those which understand the Lord Jesus against the background of the Old Testament, as "fulfilling" the prophets, as akin to them in His teaching about God, as carrying on, even though He undoubtedly develops and enriches and uplifts, the Old Testament revelation. This great distinction cannot be an accident. The truth is that we can only understand the Christian revelation aright if we see it as the crown and goal of the Old Testament story. We must relate Christ to history, as we must relate Him to philosophy, if we are to understand aright all that He is and all that He has done.

There have been some in our day who have been content *not* to relate the Lord Jesus to a philosophy of the universe. They have read of Him, of His words and deeds, they have been attracted by the beauty of His character, they have submitted their minds and hearts to His Lordship, they have prayed to Him. They have said "Jesus has the value of God to me." And they have thought that that was enough. But it is *not* enough. We do not really want to know anything else than this—Is He God? Was He present when the world was created? Will He judge the quick and the dead? Is all the meaning of history summed up in His sacrifice? He is God from all eternity—value must be rooted in reality.

And we must relate Him to history also, and that is the importance of the Old Testament. There is a way of exalting Christianity which has been popular in some quarters during the last twenty years which is radically false and unsound. It consists in saying, "Apart from Jesus Christ—His words, His life, His death, His Resurrection—apart from the revelation in those events, we know nothing clearly about God." Now that sounds plausible at first—very Christian, very devout. But it doesn't bear thinking out. Are we to say that here *only*—only at that one point of space and time—is there revelation of God? Obviously not. There was preparation in the world for Christ in divers ways, in many bits. God spoke to the fathers, preparing their hearts and minds for the coming of His Son.

And that preparation took place uniquely in Israel. It is true that Catholic Christianity is a great tree which has its roots struck deep in the instincts and needs and experiences of many peoples. What was most vital and real in pagan religion in the first centuries of our era, the sacramental religion of the mysteries and their deep longing for salvation, for union with God and for immortality, was absorbed into Christianity, and made its permanent contribution to its faith and practice. Plato and Aristotle, Zeno and Epicurus, left thoughts and words which the Church has used to express God's revelation of Himself and of His will. We can recognize, gladly, that in Brahminism and in Buddhism, and in ethnic religions of different levels of importance, God has spoken "in divers ways and in many bits." And yet the fact remains that the revelation which is recorded in the Old Testament is so important that outside it, and the Catholic tradition which enshrines it, all else that humanity has learned or guessed or thought about God hardly matters at all. And in saying this we do not forget Plato.

If God's revelation of Himself to Israel had not taken place, and all other pre-Christian teaching about Him had been as it has been, the world would have been immeasurably poorer; but if all other religious tradition had been blotted out, and the Old Testament had remained, man's knowledge of God had been almost unaffected. God has revealed Himself, not generally and indiscriminately and equally to all nations and to all men, but specially and particularly to and through one people, and to that people in and through a succession of specially inspired men. That may seem unfair or unlikely, but that is how things have actually happened. And if we are content to see facts as, in some sense, at least, the expression of God's will, then we can say that it is through the individual and particular, rather than through the general and the whole, that God speaks to

men. There has been one, and only one, Incarnation. The Incarnate Word confined Himself to one little country, smaller than Lancashire. He trained a few men, that through them He might, at last, persuade the world. From the particular to the general is the Divine method.

The Old Testament, then, is the record of the preparation for Christ, the story of the developing revelation which provided the forms of thought and speech by which He was able to convey to men as much as they could grasp of His revelation. It begins with the naïve, almost childish, story of how God moulded clay and made a man, and breathed into him, and he lived and became a companion with whom his Maker walked and talked in the evening coolness. It reaches its climax in the wonderful insight and spirituality of the Servant Songs in the second part of Isaiah. It is, rightly read, the most fascinating story of progress in all literature; progress in culture, in morality, in religion; a " spiritual " evolution, in the richest meaning of that word. But when we face the facts of that development we find that they are not at all what we should have expected. We assume that spiritual evolution has taken a line which, as a matter of fact, it has not taken. We assume that it began with the magical, with ceremonial, with cultus, with what was corporate and social, and that it moved further and further away from this to a goal which was to be spiritual, ethical, personal, and inward. But the actual facts were not so simple as that. At the very beginning the Hebrew religion was ceremonial *and* ethical, social *and* personal, external *and* spiritual; and through all its progress until the end it kept these two elements together. It never reached the point where public worship and ceremonial and external forms were left behind or lost or swallowed up in a merely spiritual or ethical or individualistic type of religion. That is significant to-day. It is important that Liberal Protestantism should realize that the whole long story of religious development from Moses to Christ shows these two " moments " in fruitful inter-relation, the external cultus enriching and enriched by inward prayer and moral obedience.

The same thing can be put in another way. One of the most interesting things in the Old Testament is the dramatic struggle between prophet and priest. It appears in the earliest written prophecy, that of Amos, it is seen in Hosea, in Isaiah, in Micah, and elsewhere. Doubtless this has been exaggerated by radical Higher Critics, who think that life and men are ruled by logically consistent formulæ, much more than is actually the case. But the conflict is there. If we are to understand the religion of Israel, if we are to see what the preparation for Christ really was, if we are to learn from the rich comprehensive-

ness of the Old Testament revelation of God, we must go to school both to priest and prophet. Neither is before or after the other, neither is finally victorious. And the proof of this, if proof be needed, is that the Old Testament revelation reached its goal and climax in One whose office and work are interpreted, even by Protestant theologians like Ritschl, under the heading of "Priest" as well as under those of "Prophet" and "King." The Hebrew prophet represents direct experience of God, the life of individual fellowship and obedience which is the beginning and end of religion. The priest stands for tradition, authority, public worship, the machinery of the Church, without which religion cannot live, still less propagate itself. It goes without saying that both are necessary. The strange warring fellowship between them which makes so much of the spiritual drama of the Old Testament represents a necessary element in every progressive positive religion.

The fundamental element, however, in the Old Testament preparation for the Christian revelation is, of course, its vision of God. Here alone, in that great line of religious tradition which is Hebrew religion, and the Christianity and Mohammedanism which developed out of it, is there any clear, continuous, and certain conviction of monotheism, in contrast with polytheism on the one side and pantheism on the other. Monotheists there have been outside this tradition, of course, but no persistent monotheism. The personality, the holiness, the majesty of God are never in doubt in Hebrew religion. What has been said of the whole Bible is patently true of the Old Testament; it is the book of which God is the Hero. The majesty of God is its fundamental theme. In the golden age of prophecy, in Amos and in Isaiah of Jerusalem, it became the majesty of a righteous God, and in the crown and climax of prophetic religion, in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, it becomes the majesty of a God of love, a prophecy which, in the deepest sense, found its fulfilment in the Incarnation.

This, then, is the value of the Old Testament, as an abiding message for human life, and as a *præparatio evangelica*. It shows us the rich inclusiveness of any religion, combining cult and conduct, the prophetic and the priestly, vision and authority, which is Divine enough to be fully human. It is an authentic revelation of the living God.

A. E. Baker.

TRADITION

I

THE scope of the following article is an enquiry into the meanings of the word *Tradition* (παράδοσις) as employed in the Greek Fathers. But although the research upon which it is based, and the illustrations which it embodies, are thus restricted to Greek writers, I have reason to believe that a careful examination of Latin patristic writings would disclose very similar conclusions.

The essential key to the interpretation of the word is the realization that it is capable of bearing two quite distinct meanings. In both cases it includes the notion of a transference effected from one person or body of persons to another. But transferences are of two kinds. An object may be handed over from one ownership to another, and the transaction be thus finally completed: in this sense transference implies immediate delivery and nothing more, as when an academic person " delivers " a lecture. On the other hand, an object may be handed along by a series of agents, as a letter is by the various employees of the Post Office, or handed down, not primarily for the benefit of the immediate recipient, but rather with a view to its own permanent preservation (like a family heirloom), for the use and enjoyment of successive generations of possessors: in these cases the dominant sense of the word is not delivery but transmission through intermediaries. *Tradition* quite definitely meant to the Greek Fathers both delivery and transmission, and the former at least as frequently as the latter.

II

It occurs once in Chrysostom (*in Matt.* 84. 1, 7. 797D) for the literal delivery of the person of Jesus Christ to the Jews by Judas Iscariot. Metaphorically, Cyril of Jerusalem employs it of the delivery of those under instruction to the creed. This is an odd use, particularly in view of the common expression *traditio symboli* for the delivery of the creed to those under instruction; but, no doubt, it is derived from *Rom.* vi. 17, " that form of teaching whereunto ye were *delivered.*"

Rather more commonly it signifies the delivery of information or instruction; for instance, Clement of Alexandria speaks of teachers who left no written instructions because they did not want to distract " their educational effort *to impart information* (τὴν διδασκαλικὴν τῆς παραδόσεως φροντίδα) by the irrelevant

effort of literary composition" (*ecl. proph.* 27. 1, 996). So Origen, in speaking of the relation of teacher and pupil, refers to the *tradition* or delivery of knowledge (*in Jer.* 6. 2 *ad fin.*). And in Gregory of Nyssa (*c. Eunom.* 1. 200) the word simply means "mention": no differentiation of dignity between the three Persons in the Holy Trinity is to be rashly inferred from the "order of *tradition* of the Persons" by the apostle in 1 *Cor.* xii. 4-6 (*τὴν τῆς παραδόσεως τῶν προσώπων ἀκολουθίαν*).

But the most striking of all the uses in this class is that by which the word is applied to the divine institution of sacramental ordinances. Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Theodoret all refer to the original event described in *Matt.* xxviii. 19 as the *tradition* of the holy sacrament of baptism: it is perfectly clear that they are not speaking of any tradition handed down concerning it, but to the original act of institution by Our Lord (Bas., *c. Eun.* 3. 5 [1. 276E], Gr. Nyss., *c. Eun.* 3. 9 [vulg. 11] 61, Thdt., *ep.* 84 [Schul. 4. 1153A]). And Theodoret uses it similarly of the institution of Holy Communion: "in the *tradition* of the sacrament he called the bread Body and the wine Blood" (*eran.* 1 [Schul. 4. 26A]).

Corresponding with its sense of "delivery" *tradition* often denotes the thing delivered. This often takes the form of a statement or narrative, as when Eusebius (*h.e.* 3. 39. 7) mentions that Papias, having ascertained various facts from Aristion and the elder John, "puts their *statements* (*παραδόσεις*) in his own memoirs." The word means here the facts which of their own store of knowledge these prime authorities delivered to him. At other times the reference is not to oral authority but to written narratives. Dionysius of Alexandria (*ep.* 5 [3] [vulg. 7] init.) mentions his investigation of the treatises and *statements* (*συντάγματα καὶ παραδόσεις*) of certain heretics, which are clearly documentary. Eusebius (*h.e.* 3. 10. 2) quotes Josephus' description of the Pentateuch as containing "the laws and the *narrative* (*παράδοσιν*) of the anthropogony." Gregory of Nyssa (*de virg.* 11 fin., M. 46, 369A) refers to the constituent parts of the Bible as "the prophets and the law . . . the *statements* of the gospels and of the apostles (*εὐαγγελικαῖς τε καὶ ἀποστολικαῖς παραδόσεσι*)."

Again, *tradition* means canonical regulation (*i.e.*, a regulation delivered by authority) three times in the correspondence of Eusebius and the Emperor Constantine, relating to the proposed translation of Eusebius from the see of Cæsarea to that of Antioch. Such translations were contrary to "the canon of the Church and the apostolic *regulation* (*παράδοσιν*)" (i.e., *can. apost.* 14, seu. 13) (Eus., *vit. Const.* 3. 62. 3). In *apost. const.* 8. 46. 6, it denotes the ecclesiastical functions delivered to an

individual minister in the Jewish hierarchy, or, as we should say, *commission*: "each grade preserved the circumscribed ministry which it had received; and if anyone ventured to advance beyond his *tradition*" he was punished.

The two uses just indicated are of great value in throwing light on the general sense of *tradition* as a thing delivered by due authority, though instances of either are rare (if, indeed, those quoted are not actually unique).

But the word fairly commonly denotes an authoritative declaration, deposit, or revelation of truth. Thus in Irenæus (*hær.* 3. 3. 4) the church in Ephesus is stated, owing to its direct and prolonged association with two apostles, to be "a true witness to the apostles' *tradition*." In ch. 11. 6 of the epistle to Diognetus (a fragment which does not really belong to that work, and is conjectured by Lightfoot to be possibly by Pantænus), it is said that "the apostles' *tradition* is being preserved." Athanasius (*ad Serap.* 1. 28 init.) speaks of "the actual original *tradition*, teaching, and faith of the Catholic Church, which the Lord bestowed, the apostles preached, and the fathers guarded." And as late as John of Damascus (*fid. orth.* 1. 1, 124A), it was possible to refer to biblical revelation in general as "the divine *tradition*." In these and other instances the word *tradition* is exactly equivalent to such expressions as "the deposit of faith," "the faith once delivered to the Saints," or "divine revelation."

III

We may next consider a group of instances in which it seems probable that *tradition* covers both authoritative declaration and successive transmission. Naturally there are many contexts in which either or both of these senses are equally admissible, and there is often nothing in the surrounding words to suggest that one is intended to the exclusion of the other. The fairest translation of *tradition* in these circumstances is, therefore, by some neutral English word such as "teaching."

The use of some such word is specially desirable for another reason. When we pass from the thought of what Christ or the Apostles once delivered, to the thought of what the Church delivers, in turn, to each successive generation, the idea of the delivery concerned has acquired a different shade of meaning. The Church delivers her teaching not only, and not chiefly, because she knows by direct experience, intuitively, but because she has learnt from others, and her experience confirms what she has been taught. There is an element about her promulgation of the Gospel which was absent from the teaching of Christ. He spoke with authority, not as the scribes; but the Church's

word, though it is spoken with an authority which the scribes did not possess, has, nevertheless, a certain limited affinity with the scribal manner. "Teaching" covers everything: the ancient revelation and deposit of evangelical truth, its guarded transmission through qualified and consentient witnesses, and the successive proclamation of it by the living voice in each generation to such as have ears to hear.

It is reasonable to suppose that the "*tradition* of the elders" (*Mark* vii. 2, 5, 8, etc.) means "what the elders taught to their disciples," as much as "what the elders handed down." Indeed, Our Lord takes up the expression, quoting in reference to it the phrase "precepts of men," which certainly conveys that sense. So we find in Justin (*dial.* 38. 2) an exhortation to neglect "the *tradition* of your own teachers," and Irenæus (*hær.* 1. 10. 2), after stating the variety of the agents by which the Church "preaches, teaches, and delivers (παραδίδωσιν)" the truth, insists that "the force of the *tradition* is one and the same" everywhere. So, too, Clement of Alexandria (*strom.* 7. 16, 95. 1) mentions "the ecclesiastical *tradition*," Eusebius (*c. Marcell.* 1. 1. 36) describes how the "Church sets her seal to the testimonies derived from the Holy Scriptures by her extra-scriptural tradition" (*i.e.*, the *tradition* of the written word and of the living voice are joint elements distinguishable in a single process of instruction), Cyril of Alexandria (*hom. pasch.* 8. 1, M77. 556D) bids men "lay up the *tradition* of the Church like a treasure in the strong-room of the heart," and Basil (*jud. dei.* 1) refers to "the error that is according to the *tradition* of the heathen."

IV

There are, however, a few passages in which *tradition* definitely means the process of handing down information, and still more in which it denotes the information transmitted. Eusebius, for instance (*h.e.* 6. 9. 1), tells how certain information came to him, "as they relate on the *tradition* of those in succession" to the person of whom he is writing. And a passage in Titus of Bostra (*c. Man.* 3. 6) well expresses the notion of an intermediary involved: "not even the celestial powers could know these matters (the knowledge of God the Father) had there not been delivered to them a *tradition* of the facts known through the interpretation of the Only-begotten."

But it is interesting and important to observe the kind of matters transmitted, to which the name of *tradition* was applied. These were by no means always matters of dogma or of history; in fact, the nearest translation in a great mass of instances would be the word "custom." It is used in Eusebius (*h.e.* 7. 3)

for the custom of not rebaptizing those whose original baptism had been administered by schismatics; again, in the same author (*h.e.* 5. 23. 1), it refers to the Quartodeciman observance of Easter; in the seventh canon of the Council of Nicæa the expression " custom and ancient *tradition* hath obtained " refers to the primacy claimed for the patriarchal see of Jerusalem (Ælia); and Justinian, as quoted in the Paschal Chronicle, 371, applies it to the customs or regulations of the Church (in the matter of surrendering sacred ecclesiastical property) against which Cæcilian was alleged to have offended at the beginning of the African schism.

In some instances the word does mean information acquired traditionally. Thus Origen (*in Joh.* 13. 27 init.) asks if the Samaritan woman's Messianic expectation was derived " from *tradition* or from the law "; Eusebius (*h.e.* 3. 1. 1) qualifies an historical statement by the words " as the *tradition* contains "; and Basil (*Sp. Sanct.* 7, 16) proclaims, " This does not satisfy us, that the *tradition* comes from the fathers; they, too, relied upon the sense of Scripture." The last instance does indeed relate to a matter of faith, and it is therefore interesting to note that (in common with all the Fathers generally) Basil regards Scripture as the great fountain-head of the Church's dogmatic tradition and the test of its value.

Another not infrequent use of *tradition* is in connection with the interpretation of words or of Scripture. In this association the word signifies literary or theological usage. Thus in summarizing Eusebius' letter to his see, defending his acceptance of the ὁμοούσιον at Nicæa on the ground that there was adequate authority for its use in the carefully guarded, non-Sabellian sense which he defines, Athanasius (*de decret.* 3) states that Eusebius " wrote a letter . . . saying this was the Church's faith and the *usage* (παράδοσις) of the fathers." Again, Gregory of Nyssa (*or. cat.* 32 med.) approaches the mystery of the cross of Christ with an explanation " which has reached me from *tradition*." And Origen (*in Jer.* 20. 2, 263 med.) prefaces his exegesis of a passage by remarking, " First I will employ a Hebrew *interpretation*," where the word rendered " interpretation " is in the original *tradition*.

V

Finally, there remain the very few passages in which *tradition* is mentioned as a source of information having any distinct authority wholly independent of Scripture and supplementary to it. There are three with which I am acquainted. The first is from Basil (*de Sp. Sanct.* 27, 66: 3. 54D—55D). " Of the beliefs and preachings (δογμάτων καὶ κηρυγμάτων) guarded in

the Church, our possession of some is derived from the scriptural teaching, others we have received esoterically (ἐν μυστηρίῳ) by a process of transmission from the *tradition* of the Apostles. Both these processes have equal force for religion."

Here is at first sight an exciting denial of the usual patristic position of the sufficiency of Scripture to justify dogmatic beliefs —a position which elsewhere Basil explicitly maintains. But as we read on further the mystery is resolved. What Basil has in mind is not what we now call dogma at all, but certain customs and practices of which his illustrations are worth enumerating. They are: making the sign of the cross; turning to the East in prayer; the words of the consecration in the Liturgy (" since we are not content with those mentioned by the Apostle [*i.e.*, S. Paul in 1 Cor.] or the Gospel, but preface and subjoin other forms . . . receiving them from the extra-scriptural teaching "); the benediction of water and oil in baptism, the very use of oil therein, and the threefold dipping (" from what scriptural authorities ? Surely from the unpublished esoteric *tradition* "); and, after a few other minor points, the actual formula of the baptismal Creed (57A).

All these, and suchlike things, says Basil, belong to the *arcanum fidei et cultus*, and he gives reasons why they should not be published broadcast: nevertheless they are as authoritative in their own sphere as is the faith embodied in Scripture, since their institution (which is what *tradition* means, at least in the passage I have quoted first) is due to the Apostles or, in some instances, the " fathers " (55D).

The second instance is in Epiphanius (*hær.* 61. 6), where *tradition* means exactly the same. He is asking for a solution of certain superficial contradictions in Scripture about the question of marriage: St. Paul says, If you are bound to a wife, do not seek to be loosed from her; Christ said, Whosoever does not leave father and mother . . . and wife . . . is not my disciple. He answers, that recourse must be had, first to common sense, to understand the precise bearing of each such passage; and, secondly, " to *tradition :* since it is not possible to comprehend everything from Holy Scripture: the holy Apostles delivered (παρέδωκαν) certain things in Scriptures, certain others in *traditions*," quoting 1 Cor. xi. 2, etc. Clearly he is referring to the customs followed upon apostolic authority by Christians from the earliest times: and he goes on to mention that the apostolic regulations forbade marriage only to those under vows of celibacy. Consideration of primitive Christian institutions does often throw light upon the meaning of obscurities in Scripture—a perfectly sound and sensible argument.

The third instance is in Chrysostom (*in* 2 *Thess.* 4. 2

[11. 532B]). Commenting upon 2 *Thess.* ii. 15 ("hold fast the *traditions*," etc.) he observes, "From this it is plain that they did not deliver everything by epistle, but many points also in unwritten form (or, apart from Scripture): but the former and the latter are similarly worthy of acceptance. So let us regard the *tradition* of the Church also as worthy of acceptance. It is a *tradition*, seek no further."

The elucidation of this statement is not to be found in the immediate context, but in his comment (*hom.* 5. 1, 538B) upon 2 *Thess.* iii. 6, "not according to the *tradition* which you received from us." This comment is brief and entirely to the point, ranging him side by side with Basil and Epiphanius: "He means *tradition* (*i.e.*, institution, ordinance) relative to practical matters (διὰ τῶν ἔργων): and he always definitely means that variety of *tradition*."

VI

To sum up very shortly, we may say that *tradition* covers the matter of all authoritative revelation and institution: God is the source and giver of it, the Apostles were entrusted with the propagation of it, the Church safeguards and transmits it, and in each age delivers it positively and with assurance to the enquirer and believer. It includes matters of practice as well as matters of faith: and so far as it relates to the latter, the Bible is the ultimate test of its accurate transmission.

LEONARD PRESTIGE.

THE SAINTS AND SAINTSHIP IN OURSELVES*

THE thing an Englishman always wants to know both about religion itself and about any particular religious observance is simply this, Is it practical? In other words, What is the good of it? And I am sure that one reason why so many Englishmen dislike the idea of bringing the saints into our religion is that it seems to them to be trifling. "Why waste time in thinking about the saints, when you might be getting on with something practical? Prayer: that is practical: God can do things. Work: well, there is no need to show that that is practical: that is a matter of course. But I do not see the good of all this talk about the saints, who are dead and gone, anyway."

I expect we ought really to begin by making a criticism of this whole attitude, natural though it comes to all of us. Is there, then, nothing that is worth doing for its own sake? I do

* An address delivered at the Northampton Anglo-Catholic Congress, 1925.

this for the sake of that, and that for the sake of something else: but what is the final object of all I do? Are there no things that have a value of their own? In other words, Are there no satisfactions attainable for man?

It is said that a distinguished mathematician once asked what "Paradise Lost" was written to prove. It is an instance of the same state of mind. Everything must be for the sake of something else. The world stands on the elephant and the elephant on the tortoise; but what does the tortoise stand on?

It is what philosophers call Utilitarianism, except that your philosophical Utilitarian says that the final object of all is always pleasure. That, of course, is simply not true. We do recognize the objects of human choice as having a scale of values of their own, quite apart from the pleasure we experience in attaining them. Truth, beauty, moral goodness, these three ultimate values are worth having for their own sake: the satisfaction we experience when we attain them in any measure assures us of their worth: but we do not desire or appreciate them for the sake of the satisfaction we attain. To put it like that would be to put the cart before the horse.

Now religion means taking account in some way of supreme truth, beauty, and goodness: being in touch with them: being influenced by them. Therefore it is its own justification. "It is good for us to be here," and we know it. It is not merely that it is my idea of enjoying myself: but that the most important parts of me are attaining their object, and I know it: and that is *why* I enjoy it. Anyone who knows anything at all about religion knows that. It gives a satisfaction which does not cloy. No doubt a very faint and partial satisfaction for most of us: but none the less a conviction that *so far as we can go* we are doing something utterly worth doing. There are other things worth doing for their own sakes, but none so much as this: for in nothing else are truth, beauty, goodness all combined. Where art, science, and ethics leave us melancholy and dissatisfied, religion gives content.

So it is no good to ask, What is the good of religion? The only answer is, Try it and see.

But, of course, we are perfectly justified in asking the question, What is the good of a particular form or practice of religion? But the meaning of that question is, Does it minister to *real* religion? That is how this Catholicism of ours must justify itself, if at all. To be a Catholic is not an end in itself: there is only one end worthy of man, and that is to be a saint. Catholicism is a means, as we believe the divinely appointed means, to saintliness. And saintliness means consecration to the true purpose of life, which is to reflect God. And we are

bold to say that the great thing lacking, in religions which fall short of Catholicism, is just this power of filling the life with God. Lacking is not the same as absent. Of course, there are non-Catholic saints. But the tone of non-Catholic religion seems to lack something which God has shown to us: the supernatural. And apart from this we may as well put up the shutters. The sole justification for all this turning of the Church of England upside down is that we are convinced that the Church of England had lost the power of making saints until ninety years ago God raised up teachers to restore it.

Saintliness means a good healthy hatred of sin, a growing union with God, a strong habit of real prayer. If Catholicism ministers to these things it is a good thing: if it does not, it is useless. Well, does it ?

I think it will not be denied that the Catholic movement has brought back the sense of sin to the Church of England. That was what the fathers of the movement stood for. They did not set out to restore the Confessional; they set out to bring men to a sense of their sins. When that had happened men came to confession. Catholicism stands for the hatred of sin and willingness to do anything to get free of it.

And it stands also for a growing union with God. The old evangelicalism had led men with wonderful success to faith in Christ: it was the work of the Catholic revival to add to that the doctrine and the practice of life in Christ. And that was brought about by the revival of the doctrine of the Church as being the Body of Christ, and of the sacraments as the means whereby the life of Christ flows through that body. Catholicism stands for the sacraments, not for their own sake, but as leading to holiness or saintliness. The characteristic Catholic doctrines, regeneration in Baptism, restoration in Penance, the Real Presence, and so on, all mean a new insight into the fact that union with God through Christ is the life of the Christian. The Catholic religion here again stands or falls with its efficacy as an instrument for producing the saintly character, or rather moulding it when produced by God Himself.

The third element in the Catholic character is the habit of prayer, and Catholicism in the Church of England is more and more coming to be a movement for helping us to pray better. A few years ago our sermons were in danger of dealing always with the sacraments: we were perhaps lacking in balance; now perhaps the favourite subject is prayer. A few years ago the constant exhortation in Anglo-Catholic churches was all for people to be more regular at Mass and Communion and Confession. Well, we have still a great deal of leeway to make up in these things, but perhaps we have learnt that there is

another matter, not less important than the others, in which we have to make up lost ground, and that is the science of prayer. That is the explanation of the retreat movement for instance: there are few things that you will find more stressed in modern Anglo-Catholicism than the tremendous need of getting apart once a year to be quiet and learn to pray. The whole revival of the practice of mental prayer, with its vast influence for spirituality, is a work of the Catholic revival. Even if we take the most controversial issue before the Church at this moment, the question of the devotion due to the Blessed Sacrament when reserved, you will see that it is a question of *a method of prayer*.

So far my points have been these: there are some things worth having for their own sakes. One of these is saintliness, because the saint is one who is in living touch with truth, beauty, and goodness all at once; in other words, with God. The characteristics of the saint are hatred of sin, growing union with God, and a habit of prayer. A religion is good or not according as it promotes saintliness, and the Catholic religion comes well out of this test. That is not to say that Catholics are in practice such specially saintly people; I am afraid you know us too well to think that. But that is only because we are not good enough Catholics. As Mr. Kenneth Ingram points out, it is possible to murder the most glorious sonata by playing it badly;* but that is the fault of the player, not of the sonata. In this connection there is a proverb which is profoundly true, that the corruption of the best is worst. And we must not think that the Catholic religion is a sort of machine which will turn out "saints" automatically.

But saintliness in this life is seldom more than a rough beginning. It seems almost obvious that its completion will have to be attained in the next. By what process we can only surmise. We really know very little about the conditions of the next world. What we do know is the character of God: Love, and Justice: and that whatever is true about the unseen world, must be consistent with those attributes of God Himself. About the vast majority of those who depart from this world we can say very little in the matter of achievement. If we can be sure that they aimed at saintliness we must be content. Then we can but commend them to the merciful hands of God to be purged as He knows how to purge them. To talk about them as already perfected saints is the height of artificiality. In this matter of saintliness they can teach us neither more nor less than those who are still living in this world. To refuse to speak of their faults is an instinct of natural piety; to pretend that they had none is mere cant.

* *The Changing Order*, p. 99.

But there are some of whom we can say with confidence, if words mean anything at all, that they did achieve saintliness. And it is they whom we speak of, think of, and honour as the blessed saints, the men and women about whom we have a moral certainty that they did achieve the object for which God set them in this world. Just who they were is a matter on which we may have our own opinion. If anyone seriously and sincerely believes his father to have been a saint, he is quite justified in honouring him as such. But the wisdom of the Church has made a selection of certain typical characters whose lives were conspicuous enough to make it true that they are obvious examples of sanctity. Sometimes there has been a formal act of canonization; but in the case of the most famous and renowned of the saints there has been no such thing. The natural instincts of Christian people have given a prescriptive right to the title of saint. But whichever way they attained their title, these are the people whom the Church proposes for our honour as those who did achieve the object of life, who believed in God and knew Him and loved Him, and are now for ever happy in His presence.

Now one of the things which Catholics are trying to do is to bring back reverence for the saints. In the early days of the movement this was shown by the revived interests in their festivals. Later on we get pictures of them in glass in church windows; later still their images in churches; and, of course, there is no difference in principle between images and what a Serbian priest once called in my hearing "glass ikons." Finally, many of us are coming back to the very ancient and Catholic practice of asking that we may be assisted by their prayers.

Now, of course, we have to face the question once more, What is the good of it? And as before we have to criticize the question itself. Is it not possible that reverence for the saints may be a thing which is desirable in itself apart from any benefits which may accrue from it? Is it not desirable to give honour where honour is due? We do not ask, What is the use of honouring our parents? or What is the use of admiring beautiful works of art? If the saints are really the work of the Holy Ghost, nothing could be more unreasonable than to refuse to recognize that work and venerate it. We do not give the saints the honour due to God: how could anyone be so foolish as to do that? But we do give them the highest honour we can give to man. People talk about worshipping the saints and ask if that can be right. It all depends what you mean by worship. The word is used in two senses. Sometimes it means adoration. Well, we do not adore the saints. That would be the sin of treating them as though they were God, and would be

akin to idolatry. But sometimes it only means honour, as the bridegroom says that he worships the bride, and as in the law-courts the magistrate is addressed as "your worship." In that sense we do worship the saints. And the honour we pay them is different in kind from that which we pay either to our wives or to the magistrates. For the holiness of the saints is no less than the presence of God in them. It is a religious veneration which we pay to them, but it is not adoration or anything that remotely resembles it. And I do not think that the fact that some people have exaggerated the honour which really is due to the saints is any reason at all for withholding what we should otherwise have felt ourselves obliged to give. It may be an excuse; it is certainly a warning; but I cannot see that it is any justification for behaving as though there were no saints.

We claim, then, that when we say (with St. Gabriel and St. Elizabeth), "Hail, Mary, full of grace: blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the Fruit of thy womb," we are doing what we ought to do: honouring her whom God has honoured; and that if we do not pay her honour we are remiss. The Mother of our Lord must come first, of course. It is not we who have put her into the first place; it is God. So with St. John the Baptist and St. Joseph; they are God's own chosen ones; God honoured them above all others; we have but to follow Him. And so with the holy Apostles, Christ chose them. And so with the martyrs, it was God who honoured them by giving them the privilege of dying for the holy Name. And when we come to the other saints, those whom the Church has singled out as specially worthy of veneration, I think we may always think of them as *types* of saintliness. We honour all saintliness when we honour these selected, "canonized" saints, just as we honour all women when we give up our place in the tram to some particular one. And always remember that in honouring the saints we are really honouring our Lord, whose sacred image is reflected in them.

But I think some of you are saying to yourselves, "I have as much respect for the saints as anyone, if that is all you mean; but what I want to know is, Don't you pray to them? That is what I object to."

Now, as before, the answer is, It all depends what you mean by praying. Just as "worship" is sometimes used to mean divine honour and sometimes honour of any kind, so "pray" can be used in two senses. In one sense it suggests that the person to whom we pray is omnipotent. That is the most usual sense of prayer. If a man says "I will pray about it," he means that he will ask God about it. But you can use "pray" in another

sense. You can say, "I do beg and pray you not to do this." You can say that to anyone. Now, in the first sense, we do not pray to the saints; in the second sense we do. But, in order to be quite sure that the two senses are not mixed up, there is only one prayer that we ever make to the saints, and that is that they will themselves pray to God for us. If there is one thing which makes it absolutely clear that we do not put the saints into the place of God, it is the fact that we actually ask them to pray to God for us.

"Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now and in the hour of our death." That does not sound like mixing up a human creature with God, does it? Just try making a prayer like that to God, and you will see at once that it makes nonsense. "Holy God, pray for us sinners." We can hardly frame our lips to say the words.

The custom of asking the saints for their prayers seems to have sprung up in the most natural way that could be imagined. A martyr condemned to suffer would be almost overwhelmed by requests that when his fiery trial was over he would remember his fellow-Christians before the throne of God. And from this it was a short step to write the same request upon his tomb, and a still shorter step onward for those who had a strong faith in a future life to continue such requests in the faith that God, in whose immediate presence the martyr was now living, would not fail to allow him to be conscious of it. I do not think we can demonstrate that the saints hear us; but it is always very difficult to demonstrate religious truth. Those who have a strong belief that a universal custom of the Church is at least likely to be in accord with the will of God, will continue to ask the blessed to pray for them. If anyone would be happier in simply asking God that he may be assisted by the prayers of the saints, there is no reason why he should not adopt that method, provided that he does not condemn those who follow the universal custom of the Church. The object is the same in either case: to associate ourselves with the company of heaven, and make the doctrine of the Communion of Saints more of a reality than it is to many churchpeople to-day.

There is a story of St. Elzear of Ariano that, when compelled to be separated for a time from his dearly loved wife, he wrote to her these words: "You desire to hear often of me. Go, visit our Lord Jesus Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. Enter in spirit His Sacred Heart. You know *that* to be my constant dwelling. You will always find me there."*

The saints do not bring us to God: but He does bring us to them!

KENNETH D. MACKENZIE.

* *Lives of the Saints.* Baring Gould.

THE CHURCH IN FRANCE IN ITS RELATION TO CHRISTIAN UNITY

ALTHOUGH Cardinal Mercier was the principal citizen of Belgium, he, more than any other, reminds one of the peculiarities of the Church in France. Just as there is much that is peculiarly British in Northern Ireland, so when we realize the ties of language, even of race, that unite Picardy and Flanders, the boundaries of 1830 make but little difference in the characteristics of a religion which is international and has its centre of unity beyond the borders of either of them. And Cardinal Mercier's leadership at a crisis in history made his name dearer to the heart of the French people than any bishop of their own. His brilliant work as the protagonist of patriotism by advocating the principles of universal justice, his striking success in presenting a Christian Aristotelianism as the metaphysical organism which united modern science with immemorial orthodoxy, and the illumination of his broad intellectual culture by the light of a supernatural charity, so as to embark on those systematic and mutual elucidations which have given the name of his see an unforgettable place in Church history, are all works which have become part of the life of the French Church. For long that Church looked coldly on the religion of a neighbour against whom the nation had fought recurrently through long centuries; and though in response to an appeal of Cardinal Wiseman, followed by the special embassies of Ignatius Spencer and Ambrose de Lisle, the French began a crusade of prayer which received its chief impulse from the Diocese of Langres, they, for the most part, left it to a country which suffered from the temper, though it had some of the virtues, of the persecuted, to represent to England the international religion of the Holy See. But the French are no longer content that Cork should appear in England as Catholicism's capital, and in fresh honour to the traditions of a neighbour to whom they are bound by a common cause of suffering and of glory, they are exploring all those national characteristics which might find as honourable a place in a united Christianity as the life of France finds in the far-flung Catholicism of Rome.

It is easy to see how the war gave a first hint in this sense, a hint which fascinated the *Aumonier General* of the French army, Monseigneur Cabanel. He, indeed, planned a book on the subject. It is easy to realize how the prestige of Cardinal Mercier gave the whole movement a new and pervading vitality, but it is not so well known that some far-seeing French priests had long since been actively at work in that direction. The

most eminent of these is a *Prêtre de la Mission*, the Abbé Portal of Paris. He owed his interest in English religion to making the acquaintance of Lord Halifax in Madeira as far back as 1889. He threw himself into the efforts that Lord Halifax was already making for reunion, and from 1894 to 1896 was very prominently concerned in the attempts then being made to anticipate what commenced at Malines nearly thirty years later. He interested Monsignor Duchesne and Cardinal Gasparri. He had long audiences at Rome with Leo XIII. He founded a periodical to discuss the subject, the *Révue Anglo-Romaine*. He was closely in touch with certain English Roman Catholics like Wilfrid Ward. These efforts have never been relaxed, the Abbé remained in close touch with leading Anglicans, and it was he who first presented Lord Halifax to Cardinal Mercier at Malines. He must always share in the honour which history will give to Cardinal Mercier and Lord Halifax.

It is true that some anonymous writers in Roman Catholic journals in England have made very unfavourable references to this distinguished priest. A student of history or human nature will soon understand why. It is not yet so very long since Roman Catholics were placed under very grave disabilities in Great Britain and Ireland, and the tradition of a persecuted but orthodox Church in a country where once few cared for even the name of Catholicism still survives amongst English Roman Catholics. Their feelings towards the Church of England are very often of distrust rather than of hope, of contempt rather than of sympathy. The first reason for this is, as we have seen, historical; it is the natural attitude of those who consider it their duty to assert unpopular principles in the face of difficulties. Let us recall for a moment what some of those principles have been: an international as opposed to a national Church, an international centre of unity, a reverence for the saints and, above all, for the Blessed Virgin, a sacramental and personal religion, an undeviating and universal orthodoxy. No readers of THEOLOGY will deny either that these are important principles, or that one at one time, and one at another, they have all been endangered in England since the Reformation. If the countenance of English Roman Catholicism has been scarred in its fight for them, there is something honourable in the disfigurement. But in connection with this tradition there is another: that English Roman Catholics have, for at least the last two centuries, tended to give to those outside their communion the impression that their religion has something alien and antagonistic to English ideals. Perhaps it has not yet dawned on them that Catholicism—and Catholicism of no merely

national kind—is the ideal towards which English religion is turning, as French religion turned. But if the non-Roman influence of religion in England were antagonistic to Catholic principles, then naturally anything in the way of corporate reunion would be unthinkable. Only individual conversions could strengthen Roman Catholicism in the country.

Now the Abbé Portal saw the weaknesses of this position, and he did not spare it; for after all individual conversions are comparatively few, and often enough whole nations and communities have been reconciled with the Holy See by treaties between authorities. If there was much modernism among Anglicans, had there not at times been much materialism among French Catholics, so-called? But, though he may have had occasionally an impression of prejudice or ignorance in England, he is a priest of distinguished eminence and of undoubted loyalty to the Holy See; he was described by Cardinal Mercier as having in Paris a position of the highest rank; he is in intimate relation with the Papal Nuncio, Cardinal Ceretti; his work has lately received a fresh commendation by a writer so distinguished as M. Goyau in the *Revue des Deux Mondes;* his frequent contributions to the chief French Church papers, *La Croix* and *La Revue de Jeunes,* spread his repute and influence all over France. In its relation to Churches separated from Rome, the present writer has already written on it more fully in an article on Cardinal Mercier which appeared in the March number of the *Nineteenth Century.*

The work of the Abbé Portal in connection with Church unity is an urgent reason why Anglicans should consider the attitude and position of the French Church; and the subject gains an additional fascination from the interest of French Catholics in attaining unity with the Christian East. This movement owed its impulse to a friendship like that of the Abbé Portal with Lord Halifax, the friendship of Leroy-Beaulieu with the Russian philosopher, Solovieff. Here, again, the French are united with the Belgians, who have made the Benedictine Abbey of Mont César near Louvain the centre of an apostolate. To the head of this house, Dom Fidele de Stotzingen, the Pope addressed in 1924 an apostolic brief. He wished the whole Benedictine Order not only to unite in instant prayer for the reunion of the East, but also to undertake specific works towards attaining it, and in particular to organize certain abbeys where the monks most apt for such studies might concentrate upon the language, the history, the institutions, the psychology, of the Eastern peoples, but, above all, their theology and liturgy. On this subject, the Benedictines naturally follow the teaching of the Holy Father with regard to union with the East in his

great encyclical, *Ecclesiam Dei*. He there declared that the work of reconciliation would have no hope of success unless the false method of dwelling upon points of difference were exchanged for searching for the essential harmony. "It is not so much by argument and controversy," said the Pope, "but by the example of a holy life, good works, and, above all, charity towards our Slav brothers and others in the East that one can really lead to union." Only a just esteem and a true charity, said the Pope again in this encyclical, can succeed in resolving differences. It is in these directions that the Church of France, so remarkable for its national and patriotic tone, unites itself with the work of Christian unity. The glorious record of French missionaries in Africa and the East is an interesting addition to this work. New orders of French missionaries were founded both in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the name and work of Cardinal Lavigerie are still fresh in French minds.

"To what extent does Gallicanism survive in the French Church?" a distinguished member of the Church of England, then in the Cabinet, once asked the present writer, and the question is one typical of the attitude of many Anglicans towards the Church of France. The answer given by a well-known Parisian priest is indisputable: It is dead. But it might be still more precise to say that it never really lived. It arose from a combination of two tendencies in the France of the Counter-Reformation. That period produced the most eminent examples of orthodox saints; first among them are St. François de Sales, St. Vincent de Paul, and Sainte Jeanne de Chantal. But the names of Bossuet and Fénélon belong to the same period. With these, however, there were two tendencies contrary to Catholicism: one was the theory of irresponsible imperialism which developed from the teachings of Machiavelli, and was elaborated into the fantastic doctrine of the divine right of kings; a theory which appeared in a more reasonable, but a more Erastian form, in England, in the *Leviathan* of Hobbes. Dr. Figgis used to say that this non-Christian theory of nationalism was the product of the Reformation; it is equally true to say that the Reformation was the product of this theory. Each, in fact, was a different manifestation of the tendency which marked the breakdown of mediævalism. The subject is of universal interest; it is also the foundation of an understanding of Church history in France.

The two great movements of the Middle Ages were involved in the relations of Charlemagne and the Papacy. Charlemagne was a great Christian sovereign, but like many another great defender of Christianity, he did not intend to make what he defended a power stronger than his own. And yet the claims

of empire, even of universal empire, are a small thing in comparison with the claims of an institution which is the organ of a Divine authority.

Conquering kings show a perennial unwillingness to submit to an external instrument of universal law or justice founded on eternal truth. That was the great argument which distracted the Middle Ages and led finally to their breakdown. It led first to a separation of the Eastern nations from the Holy See, for the idea cannot really be entertained that the question of stating or leaving unstated one of the most arcane mysteries of the Divine Nature was what agitated the Eastern and the Western peoples. It was an affair of national rivalry and racial animosity. And in this neither side can be called free from blame.

The same difficulty led to the arguments which distracted the Florence of Dante, the rivalry between the Guelfs and the Ghibellines. For the claim of the Holy Roman Empire which succeeded to the supremacy of Charlemagne was to guarantee the peace of the world by a universal political power, and not, as St. Thomas Aquinas argued, to guarantee that peace by the recognition of a Divine law stated and applied by the authority of the Church. This was the great question which underlay the politics of the Middle Ages, and which has been shockingly obscured by such historians as Sir Charles Oman in their histories of England. For first by concentrating on the purely national aspect of quarrels, and secondly by referring only to weaknesses in the characters of certain individual Popes, they left their readers in ignorance of the urgent problem with which that age, like our own, was occupied, the question of peace founded on justice. The present writer dealt with it more fully in the *Pilgrim* of January last, a quarterly edited by the Bishop of Manchester. He showed there how again and again the authority of the Popes attained their Canossa, for there is in truth and justice a certain invincible power, against which political ambition was weak. This can be shown in different ways in the case of both Charlemagne and Napoleon. But the Middle Ages is the story of the Church's conflict with temporal power, and of her failure to overcome it, just as history since the Reformation is the history of the failure of temporal power itself, so that it turns back once more to the ideas of a World Court, of a League of Nations, of a united Church.

For in the France of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the dominance of temporal power was the influence on both Church and State. Henry VIII. and Elizabeth were arrogant enough in their assertions of their Erastian sovereignty; but were they more so than Charles V. or Francis I. ? The relation-

ship of the Reformation to the career of Charles V. is a subject that requires still more investigation; would the division of Christianity ever have been allowed to become permanent if Europe and the Papacy itself had not been distracted by the rivalries between France on the one side, and on the other that power which, as Voltaire was afterwards heard to say, was neither Holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire ?

For the France which succeeded the reign of King Henry of Navarre no longer feared the monarchs of Austria and Spain, and, though nominally Catholic, developed an impossible nationalism of the familiar type. Were not Richelieu, Mazarin, and Colbert, in their relations with the *Grand Monarque*, a prophecy of the relation of Bismarck to William I. ? Behind the divine right of kings was a tendency to combat the ideas both of right and divinity; and in the moral outrage caused by this tendency, which influenced even Bossuet, a revolutionary piety arose. It shared many doctrines with Calvinism, but it took no longer Calvinism's form; it took the form of Jansenism. Like all heresies, it arose with good intentions, and it inspired a great enthusiasm; like all heresies, it was a reaction against an error. And the fault which dominated that age was formalism.

The Reformation no longer seemed the dawn of spirituality, and the Renaissance was leading on towards Racine and Boileau. Bernini was an Italian, Velasquez a Spaniard, Milton an Englishman. The genius of France expressed itself in grand convention. Anticipating the work of Wesley a hundred years later, but more distinctly sacramental in their principles, the Jansenists sought an interior devotion, a personal evangelicalism, a fervour emancipated from all discipline but its own. There is much that is fascinating in that age, as we beautifully see in that brilliant transcript of its romance, *John Inglesant;* and as Shorthouse himself found, not the least fascinating of its movements was Jansenism. That movement gains an additional savour, perhaps, from its persecution by the zeal and discipline of a society which, though rich in heroes, has sometimes appeared to some to harbour the unscrupulous, the Company of Jesus. It was the combination of the elevated indiscipline of Jansenism, with the mundane legalism of the Court and the Government, which divided many Frenchmen from the historic centre of Catholic unity. But we must overestimate neither the force of the Gallican tendency nor its duration. In the country as a whole the Jesuits triumphed; they found the antidote to Jansenism in the new movement of fervid devotion to the Saviour which arose from St. Margaret Mary Alacoque's visions of Christ manifesting His

burning love in His heart aflame; and, finally, at the end of the century, they obtained the revocation of that Edict of Nantes which had obtained for France a century of religious toleration hundreds of years before such a thing was even contemplated in England.

Great names like those of Racine and Pascal, as well as of Fénélon and Bossuet, are found among the French Catholics of the seventeenth century. We cannot say the same of the eighteenth. It was the age of Diderot, of the Encyclopædia, of Voltaire. And in many ways the Bishops of France were almost as unworthy, let us say at once as scandalous, as the Bishops of England at the same time. The ideas of English individualism captured the French mind, and Rousseau has been described as Locke in penny numbers. The other side of the picture, made so vivid for all readers of English by the thrilling eloquence of Burke, was painted in France by Tocqueville in *L'Ancien Régime et la Revolution*. But neither of these were pictures in which religion dominated the interest.

It was not until the nineteenth century that the French Church revived. Lamennais and, for a time, Lacordaire and Montalembert, illustrated the less orthodox tendencies of the revival in the journal *l'Avenir*. Chateaubriand in *Le Génie du Christianisme*, and a Savoyard diplomat, Joseph de Maistre in *Du Pape*, established the French Church in its present position. *Le Génie du Christianisme* was a departure from the tradition sustained by La Bruyère. It was written for those like Sir Austin Feverel to whom "culture is half-way to heaven," and identified the Catholic heritage with beauty, genius, and civilization. Written with much attractiveness, it aimed at showing that Christianity itself is charming, and the book made an irresistible appeal to the excellence of French taste. Voltaire himself, and even Rousseau, were cited as witnesses in the cause of the Church, but it was the aim of Chateaubriand to identify its tradition with the literary one of Bossuet, Fénélon, Pascal, and Racine.

A greater book is *Du Pape*. It is not too much to say that that book, written in 1817, had more influence over French religion, and, indeed, over Roman Catholicism as a whole, than anything since the Middle Ages. For it was the first book since that time that stated the moral importance of the Papacy in the international economy of Europe, and so anticipated the great problems which arose with the growth of conscription, and which reached their culmination, exactly a hundred years after *Du Pape* appeared, in applying the Peace of Versailles. To say that the book was the reactionary impulse of the reactionary Vatican Council gives one no idea of the subjects of which it

treats. It is true that *Du Pape* anticipated almost word for word the guarded statement by which the Council declared that when more explicitly defining the implicit truth concerning faith and morals to be held by the universal Church, one voice would of itself speak to the Church unerringly. But the book was busy with a much larger question: how to secure for society a law, a court, a standard of truth, a guarantee of sanity and civilization, in a word an effective unity of Christendom; in doing so it defined the scope of the Papacy in terms that were both constructive and constitutional. France had long since become the Churchyard of Gallicanism; this book was the charter of a new freedom written on the tombstones. France had long cherished the title of "elder daughter of the Church," just as the wealthy *Ecclesia Anglicana* of the Middle Ages loved to describe itself as "Mary's Dowry." But France, which had seen the revival of Catholicism in Napoleon's patronizing and bullying of Pius VII., now became with Austria the champion of the States of the Church. This was the final phase of the long and fatal rivalry between France and the Central European power for hegemony of the Church. It survived even the capture of Rome, and is still associated with French policy in the Eastern Mediterranean.

But in the twentieth century, as all remember, France began by abandoning her ancient rôle. The Government broke off relations with the Vatican, she withdrew endowments and prestige from the Church, she dissolved the monasteries, she exiled the Jesuits, and seized Church property. It was not unnatural, therefore, that the anticlerical politicians felt uncomfortable when Germany had declared war. But the faithful became the leaders of patriotism; the priests rushed to the trenches, even as common conscripts, combining with the duties of the soldier the spiritual offices of the ministers of grace; the influence of Cardinal Mercier, and the eminence of Marshal Foch, a daily attendant at Mass and the brother of a Jesuit, were the outstanding examples of Catholic patriots who made the anti-clericals ashamed of themselves. A great change took place. The Jesuits returned, the religious appeared again in community, the Church regained prestige, and full relations with the Vatican were renewed. A Socialist premier tried to revive the old quarrel, but the attempt led to his downfall; the eloquence of the Jesuit father Doncœur, and the brilliant diplomacy of the Papal Nuncio, Cardinal Ceretti, were the outstanding things in the battle the French Church made against M. Herriot and his party, and unless the Socialists are returned in great power, the Church will remain secure.

But the Vatican's task needed great adroitness, and the difficulty with the *lois laiques* proved what admirable arrangements

the present Pope made in his decrees about the Association of Diocesan Congregations.

The persecution was due not, of course, to the Protestants. That small but admirable body, distinguished like the Catholics of England for their high moral standard and their fervour, deplored the persecution of the Church, and stigmatized the stupidity of France for forfeiting the advantage of her relation with the Holy See. The attack came not from rival Christians, but from those to whom the Gospel of Christ was itself anathema. For the Socialists of France are opposed to all forms of Christianity alike; they recognize in the New Testament something which is entirely incompatible with their policy. At the same time, in international relations, they are far more friendly to the counsels of the Holy Father than their political rivals, who attach so much importance to friendliness with the Vatican and the Church. That is the anomaly of the situation. France still shows more clearly than any other country, as she has always shown, how nationalism flourishes in the international Church, and how patriotism, which is one of the principles of Catholic ethics, is sometimes allowed to become the assailant of the rest; and how finally its usurpations are its suicides. It shows also how, in their relations with it, the Popes have followed the example of St. Paul, to act " not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy."

At the present moment the prestige of the Church is high, its influence powerful. And it will be supported by all politicians who have the welfare of France at heart, not necessarily because they believe in it, but because its influence with regard to marriage has become a matter of life and death to France. Her vital statistics are a fen of stagnant waters, and she has over 3,000,000 foreign workers employed in her territory. Except amongst pious Catholics, it is almost unknown to see more than one child, or at least two, in a family. But Church attendance is not high. The influence of Christianity in France does not reach the masses, but it is indirect when not concentrating through an *élite*. It does not bring the whole population, in other words, into regular communication with the means of perfection, but it is a strong current in the stream of their dominant ideas, although for forty years it has been struggling against a lack of religion in the primary schools. Among the upper classes it is much stronger. No better example of its power to permeate could be found than the anticlerical Anatole France who, though he powdered all he observed with mockery, yet subjected everything to his passion for beauty, not least, of course, for beauty as perceived by the senses. But in every book of Anatole France there is the impression of his fascination by the beauty

of holiness and the beauty of Holy Church. An uncompromising Catholic has succeeded Anatole France as the first French novelist, Paul Bourget, whose admirably told stories always involve an ethical or metaphysical problem. Henri Bordeaux, Réné Bazin, Paul Claudel, Georges Goyau, Jacques Maritain are all distinguished writers of the Church, but an even more beautiful prose is written by the Dominican Father Janvier, the preacher of the Lent sermons in Notre Dame. Equally interesting is the exposition of Catholic philosophy from the leading non-Catholic philosopher, M. Etienne Gilson.

There is in the French Church, therefore, a store of subjects of absorbing interest to the English mind and a closer intimacy with French Catholic thought would anticipate one result of the union of Churches; it has long been the way of the French mind to give rather than to take, but when Gilson, Maritain, and, above all, Janvier have so much to offer, it is indeed a pity that their names should be almost unknown in England. And the interest of such works becomes even greater at a time when the French Church is illumined by that great example of charity which was given it by Cardinal Mercier, and when, indeed, every aspect of Christian unity presses itself more insistently upon the observation of all. It is to that great movement, in which the French Church unites with the centre of Catholic unity, the Pope who appeals with such reiterated urgency to all Christians, whether in his flock or not, to study any means to overcome their unhappy divisions, it is to the divinely inspired impulse towards Christian unity to which every Englishman yields who looks with closer interest, with preciser knowledge, with warmer sympathy on that dramatic and absorbing phenomenon, so close through long centuries to the spiritual life of England, the phenomenon of the Church of France.

R. E. Gordon George.

Note.—A remarkable essay on Church Unity from the French point of view appeared while this article was in the press. The essay is called "Croisade pour l'Unité du monde Chrétien," by Marie-André Dieux. Paris: Gigord, 15 Rue Cassette.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Among contributors to the current number, the Rev. G. L. Prestige is at work on a Lexicon of Patristic Greek, and his study of the word Tradition is a bye-product of that task. Mr. R. E. Gordon George is a Roman Catholic layman, who contributed an article to this Journal last September on "Church and State in Italy." We hope to publish in August and September two articles by Professor C. H. Turner on "St. Peter in the New Testament" and "St. Peter in the Early Church" respectively.

The following passage, taken from the "Letter of the Corpus Association," No. 9, will interest many who are not connected with this great College at Cambridge:

"On a visit to Trinity College, Dublin, the Librarian found in the Library a transcript of the Rites and Ceremonies at the Consecration of Archbishop Parker, from the original in our library. The note on the back of the Dublin transcript is interesting. After the testimony of the Public Notary and Principal Registrar of the University of Cambridge, dated January 8, 1674, there follows this note:

"'C. C. C.,

"'We the Master and Fellows of Corpus Christi College in the University of Cambridge do hereby declare and testify that this writing, being a narrative of Archbishop Parker's consecration in Lambeth Chapel, is faithfully transcribed from the original record in our College Library. And that we are fully satisfied that the said record is as ancient as the date it bears and the occasion to which it doth refer. Nor can we doubt but the clear and evident tokens of antiquity which it carries will as much satisfy any ingenious person who shall have a sight thereof, which therefore we readily afford to those who repair to the College for that purpose. The said record with some other memories of that Archbishop, and many manuscripts of his of great value, was delivered (as we believe) soon after his death to be preserved in the library of our said College, to which (having had his education and therein) he was a considerable benefactor. But, being written on a loose piece of parchment it was at first carelessly thrown into a large box of College writings; at the bottom whereof it lay undiscovered and unknown till upon search therein for some other matters it was accidentally found out about four years since. In testimony whereof we have hereunto set our hand.

"'*Signed by* John Spencer, D.D.,
Master of the College, and
seven other Fellows.

"'*January* 8, 1674.'"

The announcement that the Bishop of Oxford has consented to become President of the Society of Sacred Study in succession to the late Bishop Ryle will be warmly welcomed by all its members. The Society's Leaflet for April, 1926, is as usual full of stimulating learning and wise guidance in regard to books.

The Rev. E. W. Lummis, D.D., writes with regard to "the Opening of the Second Gospel":

This note is suggested by that of Mr. Haslehurst in the May number of THEOLOGY, but has a different scope. It is not quite true that Mark "starts with a kind of anacoluthon," but it is true that the Vulgate, the A. V., the R. V., and Dr. Moffatt all represent him as doing so. Verses 2 and 3 are clearly parenthetical. If, then, we read verses 1 and 4 consecutively, we get good syntax: Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο Ἰωάνης [ὁ] βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. And if we then read on to verse 7, in the form καὶ κηρύσσων Ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερος . . . we have also good sense: The beginning of the glad announcement of Jesus as Christ was John baptizing in the wilderness and proclaiming "A greater than I is to follow me."

Ἐγένετο is not exactly "was," but in this context is apter than "was."

It is possible that the reference to prophecy was at first simply implied in the words ἐν τῇ ἐρημῷ. Then the citation of Isaiah was inserted; then the words from Malachi prefixed to it.

Verses 5 and 6 contain nine words which never recur in Mark. In the omitted part of verse 4 μετανοία is ἁ.λ. in Mark, and ἄφεσιν, which only recurs in the strangely un-Marcan verse iii. 29, is a distinctively Lucan word.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

The International Review of Missions. January, 1926.

A valuable and encouraging summary comes from Miss G. A. Gollock of the gradual growth of co-operation in missionary activities between the denominations during the last fifteen years. Bishop Westcott said that the impulse towards reunion would come from the mission field, and so it has proved: in China, India and elsewhere National Christian Councils have been formed, and between the Churches and Societies at home co-operative deliberation and action are now the rule where possible; the fullest opportunities lie in the spheres of education, of the provision of literature, of witness in public, social and economic questions, of home propaganda, and of the training of missionaries. Professor D. J. Fleming (New York) enumerates a large number of "friction points" in the present world situation, all full of danger and calling for the wisest and most careful dealing; he groups them under the heads of standards of living, movements of population, types of culture, and natural rights. The Rev. H. A. Junod (Geneva), in describing the psychology of conversion among primitive people, shows that while the accidents necessarily vary greatly the essentials remain much the same as those among Europeans—another testimony to the brotherhood of man, another touch of the nature which makes the whole world kin.

April, 1926.

Students both of Islam and of current events in Turkey will be much interested in an article by an Armenian writer (anonymous) who describes the recent changes of thought in that country; additional value and interest are lent by the full documentation of his remarks with quotations from the daily press and other current publications. Such phenomena as the abolition of the Caliphate, the translation of the Koran into Turkish,

protests against the mechanical repetition of Arabic prayers by those who cannot understand them, proposed changes in the marriage laws, the secularization of education, nationalism, frank criticism of Moslem ideas and beliefs and customs, reveal the revolution now taking place in Turkish thought, and the inevitable changes that will be recorded in Islam. Another article, by Dr. J. E. Merrill, illustrates with quotations the spiritual element that is to be found in Moslem literature and worship; this should both serve as a warning against ignorant criticism and condemnation, and also provide the appreciation which is essential to the right conduct of controversy. The chief points singled out are the need of true religion, of faith, of righteousness, and the spiritual intention underlying ceremonial. Dr. A. Lukyn Williams performs the same office for modern Jewish worship, and gives a number of Jewish prayers and devotions which reveal clearly the high spiritual element in Judaism; this has for some time been recognized by students, but not always by others. A fourth paper of great general interest is contributed by Miss Dora Tickell, describing the efforts made to reclaim the criminal tribes of India. These tribes have made crime their profession for generations, and are therefore the most unlikely material for reclamation; yet under Government auspices various voluntary agencies, such as the Salvation Army and the usual missionary societies, are achieving a remarkable success.

NOTES

1. LOHMEYER ON THE APOCALYPSE

THE long-expected Commentary on the Revelation, which completes Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, has appeared at last (Mohr: Tübingen. 1926. M. 5.50). It is by E. Lohmeyer, the Breslau professor, and is a very remarkable achievement. First let us note the arrangement. There are no prolegomena; the Commentary begins at once, and the Introductory matter is worked into short excursuses or deferred to the concluding pages. The book is in consequence far easier to read than most commentaries, for you are introduced at once to what you are interested in—the biblical document. Four points in which Lohmeyer departs from current English views deserve to be mentioned.

1. It is a mistake to see in the Apocalypse the popular theology of the Apostolic Age by contrast with Paulinism or the theology of the Hebrews. The writer has clearly been brought up in the priestly school of Palestinian Judaism.

2. Lohmeyer has carefully examined Dr Charles' characteristic theories and rejects them *in toto*. Thus on xxi. 4 he says: " Charles (II 144 ff) has tried to find a solution by means of a hypothesis as complicated as it is impossible, that the Seer died before the completion of his work, and that xx. 4 to xxii. 21 are his notes clumsily and unsuccessfully put together by a disciple. Charles thereby shatters the connexion into fragments, and then out of them tries to make a new connexion."

3. The Letters to the Seven Churches, which are anything rather than real letters, are addressed to seven communities, with Ephesus as their head, which represent Christendom at large. The inference is that the Churches of Asia Minor claimed to be Christendom, that is, its centre and head. The scanty available evidence favours this supposition.

After the Fall of Jerusalem Ephesus became the chief city for a while. 1 Peter is a Catholic Epistle addressed to the provinces of Asia Minor as representing the whole Church. Ephesians, the Pastorals (in a measure), and the Johannine writings were accepted because they were vouched for by the Ephesian Church. The traditions according to which the great persons from Jerusalem settled at Ephesus are based on historical occurrences; after or somewhat before the Fall of Jerusalem leaders of the Church will have migrated to Ephesus. Indeed we may say that the centre of Christendom was at first Jerusalem; then it moved to Ephesus; then, finally and permanently, to Rome.

4. That the conflict between Imperial Rome and the Church is reflected in the Apocalypse has become a commonplace. Lohmeyer boldly challenges this position. Where else do we find such a conflict in early Christian literature? Not in the Gospels, which are increasingly favourable to the Roman power; not in the Pauline Epistles; certainly not in 1 Clement, where we should expect to find it. He finds the key to the problem in the using of traditional material, the origin of which is in many cases beyond our reach, to describe the war against Antichrist, *carried on in the unseen world.* Probably Lohmeyer goes too far in his reaction; but he argues every passage effectively and shows the weakness of many interpretations which have become stereotyped in recent Commentaries.

W. K. L. C.

2.—"MARK, MY SON"

THE expression, wherever it occurs, must be interpreted literally unless there is some overwhelming objection. It is true that one man may call another his "son" when the relationship is purely spiritual, but if a letter is discovered, whenever and wherever it is written, the reader will naturally assume that a phrase like "Mark, my son" refers to some one whom the writer has begotten. The burden of proof lies with those who would assert that between the Apostle and the evangelist the relation was solely spiritual.

They will object that St. Paul calls Timothy, Titus, and Onesimus his "sons" (Col. iv. 17; 1 Tim. i. 2, 18; 2 Tim. i. 2, ii. 1; Tit. i. 4; Philem. 10). But in all these passages τέκνον is used, not υἱός, as in 1 Pet. v. 13; and we may reasonably infer from Phil. ii. 22 that Timothy was a spiritual child only. Having in 1 Cor. iv. 14 admonished the whole Corinthian Church as "beloved children," the Apostle uses the same words three verses later: "Timothy, who is my beloved and faithful child in the Lord." There can be no doubt, therefore, that Timothy was a spiritual child of the Apostle, and the same must plainly hold true of Onesimus, and of "Titus, my true child after a common faith." Dr. Swete (*Gospel according to St. Mark*, pp. xx, xxi) writes: "Mark's early history had connected him with St. Peter, and it is therefore no surprise to find him described by St. Peter (1 Pet. v. 13) as his 'son.' The Apostle who had been most prominent in the beginnings of the Church of Jerusalem must have known Mary and her son John from the time of their baptism, and may have been the instrument of their conversion. Yet ὁ υἱός μου does not involve spiritual relationship of this kind, which is more naturally expressed, as in the Pauline epistles, by τέκνον . . . Rather it is the affectionate designation of a former pupil, who as a young disciple must often have

sat at his feet to be catechized and taught the way of the Lord, and who had come to look upon his mother's old friend and teacher as a second father, and to render him the offices of filial piety." It is not easy to grasp this distinction. The relations between St. Paul and Timothy must have been very similar to those between St. Peter and St. Mark, if the last was only a spiritual son to St. Peter. Timothy and St. Mark were both converts, both had sat for instruction at the master's feet: their *χαρίσματα* were different, not their relationship. It would be simpler to assume that the one Apostle used *υἱός*, the other *τέκνον*, much as to-day one man might write "my son," the other "my child." In any case, because St. Paul had many spiritual children whom he called "children," it does not follow that a man whom St. Peter calls "my son" cannot be his blood relation.

St. Peter was married, and we may assume that he had children. It is significant that it is he who reminds our Lord that His followers had "left all" [2] (Mark x. 28; Luke xviii. 28), and that our Lord's reply refers to those who had left "wife or children." St. Mark adds lands (*ἀγρούς*) which St. Luke omits, and this gives us a hint of worldly wealth which would enable provision to be made for the family, beside that which would accrue from the fishing business. It is not unnatural that one son should bear the name of his grandfather, John.

Assuming that St. Mark was St. Peter's own son, it is not impossible that he resided at Jerusalem with his mother Mary. If the son of Zebedee was known to the high-priest (John xviii. 15), it is not impossible that the son of another Galilean fisherman should actually reside in Jerusalem in some capacity or other. St. Mark and his mother may have been in no sense of the word Christians, but they would give the Apostle a welcome when he came to the metropolis. Possibly the omission of the story of the raising of Lazarus may be due to the fact that the Apostle was not in Bethany at the time but in Jerusalem, and only heard of the event at second hand, and therefore did not cause it to be recorded. The curious story of Mark xiv. 51, 52, which seems most naturally to refer to the evangelist himself (it is exactly the kind of incident that a writer would insert if it happened to himself and otherwise omit), becomes far more intelligible if the youth had come to warn his father of impending peril of which he had heard or had merely followed him from curiosity. At any rate, there is nothing inherently improbable in a son of St. Peter's making a home for himself and his mother in Jerusalem.

Their subsequent conversion would be probable enough, and it is to their house that St. Peter turns naturally when released from prison (Acts xii. 12-18). It may be asserted that this passage conclusively proves that Mary and Mark were no relation to St. Peter: otherwise it would have been called "his house." But St. Luke was an accurate historian, and the house was not really St. Peter's; naturally he made it his headquarters, but he was often absent on missionary work (Acts ix. 31 to xi. 1), and the house would be known as the house of Mary. But it may still be urged, why does not St. Luke mention the relationship? Many relationships are mentioned in the New Testament certainly, but it does not follow that we know all of them. It is exactly the kind of detail which would get omitted from its very familiarity. How many historians of the end of last century would think to mention that Lord Balfour succeeded his *uncle* as premier? Let a man examine a budget of old family letters: how many he will have to read before he discovers who all the

people are who are referred to, unless he knows already! He is shown bundles of letters written by a married woman to her mother and brothers and sisters. He soon discovers the fact that these people, A, B, C, are brothers and sisters, but he never finds out that two of them are *half*-sisters. The fact is taken for granted, and consequently never mentioned. It is only, so to say, by chance that we know that St. Mark and St. Barnabas were first cousins: St. Paul wanted to commend the former to his converts (Col. iv. 10). More interesting still is the fact that the beloved disciple was the Virgin's nephew; nowhere are we told this, for it was too well known to need telling, and we infer it from comparison of the Resurrection narratives. It is far more astonishing that this relationship should never be told us by a historian than that we should never hear, except in a casual remark in his father's letter, that St. Mark was St. Peter's son.

With respect to Mary, it is well known that St. Peter "led about a wife" (1 Cor. ix. 5). Whether he went to Corinth or not is immaterial, but the tradition that associates him with Rome is very strong (Hastings, *D. B.*, vol. iii., pp. 769, 770). How early he went there we cannot tell, but if he went there before St. Paul wrote Romans, it may be that "Mary, who bestowed much labour on you," was his wife.

With respect to St. Mark, his desertion at Perga might be explained as an act of physical cowardice inherited from his father, but it may be more satisfactorily explained as due to family feeling. His cousin Barnabas is the leader of the trio (Acts xii. 25) who are working among Grecian Jews, but the Holy Spirit sent them via Cyprus to Asia Minor. St. Paul soon takes the lead, and the band became "Paul and his company" (Acts xiii. 3). What did St. Mark make of this? His cousin had introduced the ex-persecutor to the Apostles and dissipated their apprehensions (Acts ix. 26), but his interpretation of Christianity was hardly theirs. Even after the vision at Joppa St. Peter wavered, and had to be taken to task severely by St. Paul (Gal. ii. 11-15). The exact date of this is immaterial: the point is that it occurred. "Even Barnabas was carried away," he who had seemed so entirely reconciled to the non-circumcision of Gentile converts. St. Mark would feel that the leadership had passed from his cousin to St. Paul, and it became increasingly difficult for him to go all lengths with the Apostle of the Gentiles: loyalty to his father may well have been an additional motive for his secession. St. Paul's refusal to have him as his companion on the second missionary journey is quite intelligible (Acts xv. 38), as is also the family loyalty that made Barnabas return with his cousin from Cyprus.

Ten or more years pass, and the old differences are forgotten. St. Mark is at Rome, but he was sent to Colossæ (in all probability), and returned with Timothy to Rome. It may be that he accompanied St. Peter during these years as his "interpreter" (whatever the word of Papias may mean), and wrote the Gospel at his father's dictation. Irenæus' statement (iii. 1. 1) that it was written after the deaths of St. Paul and St. Peter is probably inaccurate, for in the first place it gives a later date to the Gospel than the other evidence warrants, and also we seem to trace so frequently and vividly the unliterary but graphic descriptions of an eye-witness. Papias' statement that St. Mark "neither heard the Lord nor followed Him" is not only accurate, but may be made to refute the notion (which would naturally gain currency) that St. Peter's son must have been a companion of Jesus Christ from the beginning.

R. S. T. Haslehurst.

REVIEWS

ESSAYS CATHOLIC AND CRITICAL. By Members of the Anglican Communion. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d. net. 1926.

THIS volume of essays deserves a warm welcome. The book is long, and all that it contains is not of equal value. But there is not one essay which we wish away; and the best have not only a valuable contribution to make to religious thought, but deal with the very difficulties which are most in our minds to-day. The book is not in the least controversial in spirit; neither Evangelicals nor Modernists will find in it an unfriendly word. But it gives us none the less what has for some time been needed, a clear conception of the general outlook of those Anglo-Catholic scholars who are now at the fullness of their powers. If Modernist criticism of Anglo-Catholicism is generally ill-informed, it is not altogether the fault of the Modernists; Anglo-Catholics have not taken enough pains to make themselves intelligible. This book will give, not only to Modernists, but to many others, just the kind of information which they require; it will thus show how possible it is to be entirely "critical" and entirely "Catholic" at the same time.

I

Now it may perhaps be useful if we begin with a comparison between this book and *Lux Mundi*. To the latter the writers themselves, like so many others, look back with the warmest gratitude. The two books differ greatly in their sources of strength. What *Lux Mundi* gave us was a real, though informal, *cursus theologiæ*, built up round the doctrine of the Incarnation; and no later volume of essays has been worthy of comparison with it on its own ground. Many of the writers in *Lux Mundi* were systematic theologians; they were strong in knowledge of Scripture and the Fathers; they omitted hardly any subjects of importance, and dealt with Christian doctrines in a balanced and comprehensive way. We cannot say all this of the volume now before us. It contains little systematic theology, the purpose of the book being rather apologetic than theological. The ethics of Christianity are untouched; and, grateful for help in the past, we are tempted to wish that Father Thornton and Dr. Kirk had written upon this subject. Indeed, to theology in the narrower sense of the term the book does not contribute much that is new, though an exception must be made in the case of Mr. Spens's valuable and interesting essay on the Eucharist. The writers have generally in view particular attacks which have to be met, or particular errors

which have to be set right. Thus Mr. Mozley, in dealing with the Incarnation, is chiefly concerned to meet modern attacks upon the theology of Chalcedon; Dr. Rawlinson and Father Knox, in dealing with Authority, to distinguish true from false authority in relation to intellectual belief; Dr. Kirk, in dealing with the Atonement, to criticize "exemplarist" theories; and Dr. Bicknell, in dealing with Sin and the Fall, to guard the truth essential to the Christian view of life from being tied to theories, ancient or modern, which are both unnecessary and open to serious objection. What they set themselves to do they do excellently, but the result is not systematic theology. When, however, we turn from the theological to the critical work, the advantage is markedly with the later book. When *Lux Mundi* was written, the Church of England was feeling the impact of Old Testament rather than of New Testament criticism, and the book had not much to say about the latter. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns and Mr. Williams are here most valuable. So again, *Lux Mundi* has not much to say about primitive religion or about psychology; and though most of its writers possessed a philosophical training, it was not peculiarly strong in the philosophy of religion. In the new book, there is an interesting essay on *The Emergence of Religion*, by Dr. James; a good deal of reference to psychology by several writers; and, above all, a splendid contribution to the philosophy of religion, by Professor Taylor. This last is, in the judgment of the present writer, the finest essay in the book; he does not know of any *Vindication of Religion* comparable to it elsewhere. If in this review he makes no further reference to it, that is because adequate appreciation and criticism demand a knowledge which he does not possess. It will be best, he thinks, to confine himself to the essays on historical criticism.

II

We turn, then, first to the essays of Sir Edwyn Hoskyns and of Mr. Williams; and it may be well to consider them together. The former writes on *The Christ of the Synoptic Gospels;* the latter on *The Origins of the Sacraments.* Neither writer is afraid to put the enemy's case as strongly as it can be put; for the moment, as Dr. Johnson would say, "the Whig dogs" are allowed "to have the best of it." But both writers begin as they do because they are ready to meet the enemy's case in the one satisfactory way, by substituting for the false reading of the facts a reading which far better explains them. Now Christian apologists too often do not effect this substitution, but confine themselves to picking holes in the enemy's

case. They do not see that, though an argument can be met by a counter-argument, a picture must be met by another picture as vivid as the one which has to be supplanted. The ordinary reader of the Synoptic Gospels, for example, often finds it difficult to conceive how the doctrinal and practical system of the Church could arise out of the life and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth. If, then, Professor Harnack, or any other scholar, suggests a way in which the transition might have been made, the ordinary reader gratefully accepts the solution offered to him; he brushes aside all arguments designed to show that this solution will not bear examination unless a better one is provided. Now it is the great merit of both the essays before us that they recognize this. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, in a valuable section of his essay, deals faithfully with some of the canons of criticism which are frequently employed, and Mr. Williams equally faithfully with some common mistakes about the mystery-religions. But their best work is of a positive character. The former shows us that between the teaching of the Christ of the Synoptists and the teaching of St. Paul, St. John, and the later Church, there is a substantial identity. The latter shows us that the mystery-religions are not needed to explain the sacraments; the sacraments were instituted by the Lord Himself, and rightly understood by His followers. With the accounts given the present writer finds himself in substantial agreement. He would, however, suggest that, if more attention is paid to Old Testament teaching—and the Old Testament is, he thinks, too little in evidence in *Essays Catholic and Critical* —the truth of the Church's teaching may be even more fully established.

We consider first the Christ of the Synoptic Gospels. We have not, Sir Edwyn Hoskyns believes, to find a road from the Lord to the Church Catholic; for the Church Catholic existed already in the Lord and the little company that He gathered round Him. The kingdom which the Lord proclaims is not a "Jerusalem" which we are called to "build" for ourselves; it is a supernatural order which descends from God, and by the coming of the Christ it is already appearing, the Lord's miracles being the signs that it is here. Thus Judaism is superseded by being fulfilled; the followers of Christ are from the first justified by faith; and eternal life belongs to them through the moral purification which faith bestows. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns does not perhaps distinguish as clearly as is desirable between the position of the Messianic company before, and its position after, the outpouring of the Spirit. The meaning of Matt. v. 17-20, and similar passages, surely is that the Christ comes to supersede the old system, but that till the kingdom

comes with power, the old law must be strictly obeyed: it is the gift of the Spirit, and that alone, which can render the new righteousness possible. Just as the Lord is at present the Christ designate (*cf.* Ac. ii. 36) rather than already the Christ, so the Messianic company is by anticipation His Body rather than already such. We do not think that Sir Edwyn Hoskyns's view differs much from this. He fully recognizes, if we rightly understand him, that the mission of Christ depends for its effective power upon His death and glorification; it is upon them that for us the inauguration of the new order depends, and the new covenant between God and His people. It is in this new order and under this new covenant of grace that the Church lives that present life of humiliation which reproduces the earthly life of the Lord; and at the great consummation it will enter into His glory. Thus the religion of St. Paul, of St. John, and of the Catholic Church is the religion of the Christ of the Synoptists; and little is needed to explain it but a better understanding of the Synoptic narrative. Now if we look back to the Old Testament we find strong support for this account of the facts. There the sovereignty, or rule of God, is ever the fundamental blessing, and the Christ is to come to bring it. The Christ is never a reformer of Judaism, or even a herald of the kingdom. He is the Inaugurator and Head of the kingdom, and as such the Lord and Saviour of His people. The passing away of disease and death, the outpouring of the Spirit, a new covenant with a power before unknown, a new and God-given "righteousness," are all expected in the great days to come. The true understanding of the Synoptic narrative explains all that the "critical reconstruction" explains; it explains the miracles, the personal claims of the Lord, and the eschatology, which to the "critical reconstruction" are all serious difficulties; it allows us to take the narratives as we find them instead of explaining large parts of them away; it is in harmony with what went before, and with what follows after, while the critical reconstruction is in harmony neither with the one nor the other. In a word, it alone is historical.

To turn to the problem of the sacraments is to turn to a problem smaller and more manageable, and yet harder because of the lack of *data* for certain conclusions. Mr. Williams's handling of this problem is much the best that we have seen. His essay is full of information and brilliantly written; and, if the speculative element seems rather large, we must remember that, when full information is lacking, speculation is unavoidable. His case primarily rests upon reasoning from facts—the Jewish origin of primitive Christianity, its repulsion from heathen influences, the shortness of the time which separated

the great Epistles of St. Paul from the first preaching of the Gospel, and the extreme unlikelihood that St. Paul's Jewish opponents would have allowed him without protest to contaminate the faith of Israel with Gentile elements. The main question is whether it can be proved that the greater sacraments can claim institution by the Lord Himself. Here again we find ourselves in substantial agreement, and would only urge that attention to the Old Testament brings new elements of strength to the Catholic case.

There is first the question of the Eucharist. That the Lord said "Do this in remembrance of me" is distinctly stated by St. Paul, our earliest authority, and there is nothing of a positive character to be set against what he tells us. It is true that not one of the Gospel accounts of the Institution seems originally to have contained this command. With this fact Mr. Williams deals, and we will only add to his argument by endeavouring to show that there is no reason why they should have contained it. Not only were the Gospels written for Christians, who knew that their central act of worship was performed at the Lord's command, but they regarded the Eucharist as the Christian Passover, commemorating the new redemption as the Passover the old. The Blood of the Lord protects His people in the approaching judgment of the world, as the Blood of the Passover Lamb protected them in Egypt; not to take part in it would be to lose our place in the ranks of those in covenant with God. It is not essential to prove that the Lord thought of the Eucharist in this way, though we think it fairly plain that He did. The point is that the early Christians so thought of it, and that there was therefore no need of a command to repeat it, since a Passover feast that is not to be repeated is a contradiction in terms. So far from the Lord's eschatological outlook rendering it impossible that He should have meant His Passover feast to be repeated, it makes it especially necessary that it should be. It is the Lord Himself who is to come, in judgment as well as in mercy, and "till He come" the immunity which the Passover Blood bestows must be continually preserved. It is quite possible, though far from certain, that our Lord expected His "return" to be soon, though the time did not lie within His knowledge (Mark xiii. 32, Acts i. 7). His consciousness was, we believe, that prophetic consciousness, which sees far into the Divine purpose, but not into the time or manner of its accomplishment. Not only in the Synoptic Gospels, but in the Fourth also, we cannot trace the relations in His mind between His "rising again," the coming of the Spirit, and the final consummation. St. Paul, who writes after the Resurrection and the gift of the Spirit

have taken place, is, of course, far clearer here. But the final consummation lay in the outlook of the Lord beyond the fall of Jerusalem, and he does not date the latter before the close of the lifetime of His own generation. There is thus nothing whatever to suggest that His Passover feast was not to be repeated.

Secondly, there is the question of baptism, or rather, as Mr. Williams rightly prefers to say, of penance, baptism, and the laying on of hands. Here again, we will but supplement his admirable discussion by a few considerations drawn from the Old Testament teaching. In the Old Testament, though Israel is always the people of God, it is always clear that "they are not all Israel, which are of Israel." Israel as a nation is always in danger of becoming a *massa perditionis*, of which only a "remnant" can be saved; and it is called repeatedly to a national repentance as the only means of escape from the Divine judgment. It is in connection with the last and greatest of these calls, that of the Baptist, that baptism makes its first appearance in Scripture; though almost certainly it had been earlier in use as a means of purification for proselytes from heathenism. What, then, is the meaning of the Baptist's call to penance and baptism? The whole people are treated as in fact excommunicate (*cf.* Jer. xv. 1 *ff.*); the Messiah who is coming will be to them, if they remain as they are, almost universally a Messiah of judgment rather than of salvation. To this call to penance and baptism as conditions of entrance into the kingdom the Lord set His seal. So the Synoptists teach (Luke vii. 26-30; Mark xi. 27-30); and John iii. 1-10 is most easily understood if we suppose that the Evangelist is adapting to those who refused baptism in his own day teaching originally given by the Lord Himself (*cf.* vv. 22-26). In this sense our Lord instituted baptism. But what is the relation of this to the Christian Sacrament? Very similar to that of the Passover to the Eucharist. Baptism is now the gate of entrance to the kingdom, in conjunction with that faith in Christ which it prepares men to give; and what it is it continues to be. But, as the Church is transfigured by the gift of the Spirit, baptism is transfigured with it; since the Messianic company to which it admits is now the Body of Christ and the Temple of the Spirit. Whether "John's baptism" is enough depends upon whether it has attained its purpose of leading men on to the Christ Himself. If it has, no further baptism will be necessary; in due time the work of repentance and baptism will be completed by the gift of the Spirit. But if the preliminary discipline has failed of its effect, and the Lord has been rejected and crucified, the old excommunication will stand (Matt. xxiii. 37-

39; Luke xiii. 1-5; Acts ii. 40). The people of Israel will still be as the heathen, and will need to be admitted to the reconstituted Church of the Spirit by repentance, baptism, and the laying on of hands. St. Peter's demand (Acts ii. 38) is just what we should expect it to be, and has the authority of the Lord Himself, whatever view we may take of the closing words of St. Matthew's Gospel. It is therefore quite unnecessary to drag in the mysteries; the facts are fully explained without them.

III

It remains to speak of Mr. Selwyn's essay on the Resurrection of the Lord. It will deservedly attract much attention, and we would urge upon all readers that they should form no judgment upon it until its final sections are before them. All will not agree with Mr. Selwyn's view. But, though some may be alarmed at first, they will find that it is fully consistent with the strictest interpretation of the Catholic Creeds. Mr. Selwyn, if we understand him aright, fully accepts the witness of the empty tomb. The body of the Lord was not cast away, but glorified; and this "on the third day." Had it been otherwise, there would have been no victory over death, and no "gospel of divine redress." But though Mr. Selwyn maintains all this, he is disposed to regard the appearances of the Risen Lord as veridical visions rather than as taking place in our ordinary workaday world, and thus far to agree with many who do not accept the Catholic view of the Resurrection as fully as he does himself. It is this twofold outlook which gives to Mr. Selwyn's essay its peculiar interest; and, though he has not convinced us, we find nothing in what he says at which the most timid "trembler for the ark" need take alarm. Our modern knowledge of psychology makes it necessary to reconsider the whole question; and we shall try briefly to do so, in view both of general considerations and of the actual evidence.

The first thing to observe is this: the Resurrection of the Lord is a fact which at present stands alone. It was not, according to Catholic belief, "the resuscitation of a corpse," and it would greatly assist discussion if our Modernist friends would cease to employ that misleading and provocative phrase. "*Nempe resurrectio*," says St. Bernard, "*transitus et transmigratio. Christus enim, fratres, non recidit hodie, sed resurrexit; non rediit, sed transiit; transmigravit, non remeavit*" (In die sancto Paschæ, Sermo 1). The Lord, *i.e.*, did not, like Lazarus, return to the old life, but passed on to a life altogether new; the change which passed over His body was not a change within the present order, but a change from one order to another.

That such a change is "unintelligible" goes without saying; a change that we could understand would be a change within the order that we know. But it is not therefore incredible; it is the prophecy of a change one day to pass over the world (*cf.* Rom. viii. 18-25). "That regeneration," says Martensen, "which necessarily involves and demands the belief, that the contradiction between the physical and the ethical, between the kingdom of nature and that of grace, shall not continue as if eternal and indissoluble, is revealed ideally in the Resurrection of the Lord." Now if the nature of the Lord's risen body is *sui generis*, we shall expect the manner of its manifestation to be *sui generis* also; we cannot anticipate the form that it will take. There is no *à priori* reason why it should not be manifested within the present world, and to others than believers (Rev. i. 7), though in fact it may have been manifested to believers alone (Acts. x. 40, 41); nor, because it is a "spiritual" body, is a vision a specially suitable way of manifesting it. Very material things may be seen in visions (Acts x. 11, 12); indeed, visions appear to be clothed wholly out of the images already obtained from ordinary experience. Thus we can face without prejudice the two questions that arise. Can visions of the Risen Lord give us sufficient assurance of His Resurrection? Do the New Testament narratives suggest that in fact it was in visions that He appeared?

With regard to the former question, we notice that the purpose of the manifestations is primarily, though not exclusively, evidential (Acts i. 3). The Risen Lord teaches (Luke xxiv. 27, 44 *ff.*), and He calls the Apostles to their work; Mr. Selwyn brings out admirably the "vocational" aspect of the appearances. But both the teaching and the calling depend entirely upon the fact of the position that the Lord has won; and, if the evidence fails, the teaching and the vocation fail with it. Now the difficulty of Mr. Selwyn's view is that, though real divine calls are often conveyed by visions, it is difficult to see how they can prove facts not otherwise known. Not only are visionary experiences open, as he says, to "countless dangers, imitations, and delusions," but at best the clothing and furniture of visions seem to be always drawn from the content of the minds of those who experience them. There is, *e.g.*, much to be said for the view that the story of the Annunciation is the story of a veridical vision with a "vocational" purpose. But could we say that this vision conveyed to the Blessed Virgin not only the call to be the Virgin-Mother of the Lord, but assurance that there is in the unseen world an angel answering to the name of Gabriel? To many, no doubt, it would seem to convey this; but would not the psychologist

say that the angel Gabriel, like that Jewish conception of Messiahship which his words seem to presuppose (Luke i. 32, 33), belonged rather to the previous furniture of her mind than to the revelation itself? And, if the psychologist would say this, would he find in the appearances of the Lord in vision any proof that he was risen from the dead? A "telegram from heaven" there might doubtless be; but telegrams bear legibly written upon them the name of the place where they were handed in, while visions are uncertified. It is true that for us to-day the spiritual experience of the Church goes far towards certifying the Resurrection of the Lord, but the question remains of the value that visions could have at the time that they were received.

But now let us look at the facts. Do the appearances of the Risen Lord, as related in the Gospels, resemble the visions recorded in the Bible and in later days? Scripture itself contains a large number of visions, in which the psychologist finds no difficulty. The vision of the great sheet (Acts x. 11-15) is an admirable example; and we find simpler examples in Acts xvi. 9; xviii. 9, 10; xxvii, 23, 24. The last three are all of the same character; they are all given by night, and to St. Paul alone. But the appearances of the Risen Lord, with the possible exception of that given to St. Paul, are of a very different character. There is not even a suggestion of dream, or trance, or ecstasy; in some cases, as in that of the walk to Emmaus, they are of long continuance, and presuppose an ever-changing physical background; above all, the Lord is seen by many—in one case by five hundred—at the same time. Are there any parallels to such collective veridical visions as these would have been? The Divine element might have been the same for all who received them: but the clothing of the visions would surely have been furnished very differently out of the different subconscious minds of the recipients. Would not these differences have been distressing to men who knew nothing of psychology, and have deprived their experience of its evidential value? We think, then, that, though Mr. Selwyn's argument was well worth development, it is not really satisfactory; and that, in the future as in the past, the vision hypothesis will not widely commend itself to Catholics, even within the restricted scope which this essay allows to it.

We must not close without a word of gratitude to S.P.C.K. for the way in which the book has been produced. In view of modern conditions, it is wonderfully cheap at its price, and should have a very large sale.

H. L. GOUDGE.

BEHIND THE THIRD GOSPEL. By Vincent Taylor, Ph.D. Clarendon Press. 16s.

A gradual change has been coming over the views held by scholars as regards St Luke's use of sources; more and more the importance of his special source has emerged. Professor Burkitt in *The Gospel History and its Transmission* (1906) maintained that Q, the main non-Markan source, contained a Passion-Narrative, which is found in Lk. and is better than Mk's version. Dr Bartlet in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (1911) argued that St Luke's second source (Mk. being the first) was a document in which the matter peculiar to Lk. had been fused with the Sayings of Q. Dr Stanton in *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Vol. II (1909), reached a similar conclusion. Canon Streeter in his article in *The Hibbert Journal* of Oct., 1921, propounded his famous theory of Proto-Luke, a document written at Cæsarea about 60 A.D., which was afterwards expanded into the Third Gospel. In *The Four Gospels* (1924) he slightly modified his position. St Luke, he thinks, made notes at Cæsarea, afterwards working them up into a complete document with the help of a copy of Q; still later with the help of Mk. he wrote the complete Gospel, inserting extracts from Mk. into his already existing framework. This is the gist of the theory: Mk. was for St Luke only a secondary authority. "Proto-Luke was, and was originally intended as, a complete Gospel"—if only for private circulation (p. 221).

Dr Taylor has written a big book in which he works out Canon Streeter's theory, which after all had only been sketched hitherto, in detail. His book at once takes a place among those of first-class importance; comparable with Sir John Hawkins' *Horæ Synopticæ* (which so much impressed Harnack), *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, and Dr Streeter's book. It is exhaustive, a model of lucid investigation, and so well written that every page can be read with pleasure. The result is as follows:

Proto-Luke is a complete non-Markan Gospel, beginning with iii. 1, the elaborate dating of John's ministry. Its sections are iii. 1—iv. 30, v. 1-11 (Call of St Peter), vi. 12-19 (Call of the Twelve), vi. 20—viii. 3 ("The Lesser Interpolation"), ix. 51—xviii. 14 ("The Greater Interpolation"), xix. 1-27, and the major portion of the Passion and Resurrection narratives. In the last section the removal of the Markan passages makes a consecutive story, so rich that it is highly improbable that it was confined to this section. In xxi. 20-36 (the Eschatological Discourse) St Luke is using a non-Markan source later in date than Mk. xiii, written when "the siege was in actual prospect

or in immediate retrospect" (p. 121). Chapters i and ii are also of later origin. The Preface may well have been written last of all. As regards Q we note that St Luke tries to impose on it a narrative form; Q is always used with non-Markan matter, never fused with Mk.

Proto-Luke rests on the sources discovered by St Luke in A.D. 60 —traditions largely connected with the Court of Herod, the Samaritans, the Women, the Seventy, and Jerusalem. The Evangelist wrote out his notes later, but in the absence of a Galilæan tradition "could proceed no further with his task until he lighted upon the Gospel of St Mark" (p. 215), which was for him "a valued secondary source" (p. 134).

Some such theory as Dr Streeter's, thus elaborated by Dr Taylor, is bound to dominate English-speaking Synoptic criticism in the near future; French and German scholars will probably take less kindly to a British theory! It is therefore desirable that objections should be stated as soon as possible. The following are some of the queries which arose in the reviewer's mind, though difficulties such as these do not prevent his giving the warmest welcome to Dr Taylor's work, and accepting the position in the main. (That caution is necessary appears from Dr Taylor's novel application of the argument from silence. Referring to certain Markan passages absent from Proto-Luke, he says: "The silence of Proto-Luke . . . [suggests] that they are examples of naïve popular tradition of restricted provenance and late date.")

1. "The *existence* of Proto-Luke . . . is a scientific hypothesis which is, to a considerable extent, capable of verification" (Streeter, p. 218). Is this really so? Mark we know, Q also—from Papias' enigmatic fragment: Proto-Luke must always remain a scholar's hypothesis, compared with Mark the Unknown by the side of the Known.

2. The excellence of Lk's Passion-narrative is a sheet anchor of the theory, but we may well imagine sources of this part of the Gospel-story which did not extend backwards.

3. Is it not multiplying entities *præter necessitatem* when such considerable sections of the special matter of Lk. as Chapters i. and ii. and the Eschatological Discourse are excluded from Proto-Luke?

4. The greater part of Lk. is said to come from non-Markan sources which the author prefers to Mk., and to represent a tradition certainly of equal, perhaps of superior, value to Mk. The Markan part of Lk. is generally acknowledged to contain very many editorial touches which represent a later stage in the tradition. Why did St Luke, who had access to such good early sources, feel it necessary to tone down the vivid details

of the Second Gospel? Granted the truth of the hypothesis, should we not suppose that the non-Markan part of his Gospel is related to the assumed earlier document as the Markan part is related to our Mark, i.e. that it is to a large extent secondary?

5. The advocates of the new theory have not, so it seems, studied the bearing of recent German Synoptic criticism upon their conclusions. This may be summed up in Dibelius' dictum, that Q is not a writing at all, but a *stratum* (see THEOLOGY, May, 1925).

6. Proto-Luke is said to be "a complete Gospel." Omitting the last visit to Jerusalem, we find that 51 verses refer to John's preaching, the Baptism and Temptation; 119 to the Galilæan Ministry; and no less than 378 to the Last Journey to Jerusalem. No wonder St Luke avoided publishing so disproportioned a Gospel!

7. The explaining away of Markan influence is carried to an excess. Thus, in the Baptism story, "the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose," and "*Thou art* my beloved Son; *in thee* I am well pleased" are sentences in which Lk. and Mk. agree as against Mt. It seems perverse to rule out Markan influence on Lk.

Again, Dr Taylor ascribes Lk. vi. 12-19, the Call of the Twelve, to Proto-Luke. Would he have done so if the document without this section had not been left with the Sending of the Seventy only—and that during the Last Journey to Jerusalem? St Luke follows Mk. very closely. Note that the second group of four apostles in Mk. and Lk. is identical: Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Thomas. Matt. varies the order slightly, Acts more considerably.

8. Where necessary, Dr Taylor attributes very free editing of Mk. to St Luke, as in the stories of the Sick of the Palsy and the Transfiguration, though in the latter case he suspects the influence of a non-Markan source. The same degree of editing in other passages is held to preclude the use of Mk., and to point to a non-Markan (and parallel) source. This seems arbitrary.

9. Lastly—and this is perhaps the most serious objection—St Luke, collecting material in Palestine in 60 A.D., was unable to secure any information to speak of about the Galilæan ministry. Nearly ten years later, in a Gospel written for the Roman Church, the information turned up. The theory, claimed to be a rehabilitation of early Christian tradition, really lands us in radical scepticism. What value can we attach to Mark in these circumstances?

The theory, so it seems, needs restatement somewhat on these lines. St Luke, visiting Palestine, secured the best in-

formation he could from all sources, oral and written (cf. the "many" of the Preface). He visited Jerusalem and Cæsarea, the latter city being nearer to Samaria than to any other division of Palestine, and met the daughters of Philip (Acts xxi. 8). These facts suggest an origin for much of his special material. But he also collected much Q and Markan material. The supposition that he first saw a copy of Q in later years at Rome, and one of Mark at a still later date, has little significance unless we hold a rigid documentary theory and isolate the documents from the traditions which they represent. In Palestine St Luke made extensive notes for his book. Were they salved from the shipwreck? Is it not possible that he had to rewrite them from memory and that this accounts in a measure for the freedom of his editing? At Rome he met St Mark and must have exchanged ideas. In a community which wrote letters so freely as the early Church did we cannot exclude the possibility that he sent to Palestine for further information. Ultimately he read St Mark's Gospel. Naturally he used written documents where they were available, but we must leave the door open both for considerable use of oral tradition and for a creative effort on the part of the Evangelist, who fused very diverse material into an artistic whole.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

Sacrifice in the Old Testament: its Theory and Practice. By George Buchanan Gray, D.Litt. Oxford University Press. 15s.

Dr. Gray, who died in 1922, is described in the prefatory editorial note as "the most distinguished scholar in the world of Old Testament study." This book was prepared for posthumous publication by a group of scholars, under the editorial care of an anonymous pupil, from Dr. Gray's MS. of lectures delivered as Speaker's Lecturer before the University of Oxford. It is in four parts under the titles: I. The Theory of Sacrifice; II. The Altar; III. The Hebrew Priesthood; IV. The Festivals. For this arrangement, and to some extent for the amount of contents, I gather that the editor is responsible. Whatever may have been the condition in which Dr. Gray left his lecture notes (described as "found nearly complete"), great credit is due to the editor and his colleagues for the final result as now presented to the world. Besides the editorial corrections there are, however, a few instances of uncorrected slips: notably in the chapter on "The Day of Atonement" there is a curious and repeated confusion between Lev. 16 and Lev. 23

(pp. 311, 313, 315, 318; on p. 321 Lev. 26 seems to be a "conflation" of the two).

Now for the contents. In the first part (The Theory of Sacrifice) Dr. Gray triumphantly rehabilitates the Gift-Theory of Hebrew sacrifice. Since the publication of Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites*, this theory of sacrifice has hardly received its fair share of attention. Of late years, however, it has gradually been making its way to the front again. Dr. Gray brings a cumulative mass of evidence from all sides to show that not merely at certain periods but from first to last and in all the sacrifices the idea of gift was present, though not to the exclusion of other ideas. What develops with the advance of religious thought is the conception of the nature of the gift, ranging from the primitive idea of a material gift of food through the stage of a gift still material, but "sublimated," "ætherealized" by the altar fire, and reaching its climax in the Old Testament when the material gift is regarded as the symbol and expression of that which is the best gift of all, a self-oblation. Dr. Gray has something to say upon the great subject of contention between Old Testament scholars: whether the sacrifices are approved by the prophets and psalmists as symbols of this gift or unfavourably contrasted with it. As we might expect, he inclines to the latter alternative, though he would leave a place for sacrifices regarded as thank-offerings. It is doubtful if he has done justice to the passages which reveal the close and sympathetic association of the prophets with the Temple and its sacrificial worship—even of some prophets who spoke most strongly against its abuse. His quotations are selective, and not really representative of the all-round attitude of the prophets. If that attitude assumed the form at one moment of conformity and at another—under provocation of grave abuses—of sweeping and apparently wholesale condemnation, both positions should be taken into consideration. Even further, if a prophet did not attempt to reconcile the inconsistency of the two attitudes, is not that after all very much "the way of a man," and particularly of an Oriental man? In spite of this, can it be gainsaid that in the last resort they would have agreed with the Hebrew equivalent of *abusus non tollit usum?* And did not some of them at least suggest that the outward gift might be regarded as the symbol of the inward self-surrender? It is a comfort to find Dr. Gray unsaying to some extent the condemnation he attributes in other places to the prophets (*e.g.*, pp. 41-47, 89). In a passage (p. 50) which is, perhaps, the best worth quoting in the whole book, he writes: "These ideas (*i.e.*, the broken spirit, the contrite heart, the readiness to do the will of God) are distinctly

associated with the conception of sacrifice as gift; they are also, at least by some writers of the Old Testament, not put forward as a substitute for the practice of external sacrifice; the author of the closing verses of Psalm li. would retain alongside of the inward gift, the self-surrender, the custom of giving outward gifts in the form of animals offered as burnt-offerings or peace-offerings." Perhaps even the scientific scholar of the twentieth century is liable to be human like the prophets of old, and to do justice sometimes to one and sometimes to the other of opposing statements without entirely reconciling the two!

As far as interest goes—meaning particularly by "interest" the legitimate interest of a subject for its vital connection with the world of human life—the most stimulating part of the book is the first section. In the succeeding discussions on the Altar, the Priesthood, and the Festivals the author seems to get out of touch with the realities and ploughs his furrow through a sterile region of archæology and in rather a heavy and wearisome style. The labour and the erudition are monumental. Point after point is taken up and followed through with a meticulous care and thoroughness. But in this attenuated atmosphere we are conscious of an academic aloofness from the practical bearings of the questions at issue upon great points of Christian life and worship. At the outset of the book we were led to hope that Dr. Gray would supply for us "that environment of thought which it is essential for any sound study and vivid appreciation of the N.T. and the new religion correctly to appreciate" (p. 33). We are grateful to him for the two chapters "The Sacrificial Service in Heaven." Here he has much to tell of Jewish visions of the heavenly Temple and Altar and their connection with the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse, which will be fresh to many of his readers. The last chapter also ("The Passover and the New Testament") brings us into contact with real live subjects. Here and there we may find ourselves at issue with him—*e.g.*, speaking of the Sacrifice of our Lord he takes no account of the references in the Epistle to the Hebrews to the heavenly *Offering:* or, again, to say that the Eucharist, "like the Jewish Paschal meal after the cessation of sacrifice in A.D. 70, is divorced from sacrifice" (p. 393), seems to ignore the use of the sacrificial terms "Body" and "Blood," and the relation of the Eucharist to the Crucifixion. But in spite of this we are grateful for the careful marshalling of old facts and the introduction of new ones. No future student of the bearing of the sacrifices on Christian worship will be able to dispense with a close study of these parts of Dr. Gray's book. But we look to him in vain for light on many points which are essential for the recovery of

that Jewish background to the New Testament. There is, for instance, no real discussion on the meaning of "Blood" in the sacrifices: not even in the chapter on "The Blood Ritual of the Passover." The key passage (Lev. xvii. 11) is only once referred to, and that quite incidentally without discussion. The significant ceremonial of presenting the Blood upon the Altar is left without attempt at explanation. This is an omission pregnant with consequences. It leads the author, on the one hand, to regard sacrifice as a destruction (pp. 28, 29), and on the other to confine the sacrifice of our High Priest to the death on the Cross. The chapter on the "Day of Atonement" contains but one (and that again quite incidental) reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Dr. Gray's style is far removed from the smooth running pen of the ready writer, and does not lighten the task of the reader. Every now and then it is so cramped and involved as to be very ungainly and hard to follow: see, for instance, one or two sentences on pp. 200, 201. In some places it is not even grammatical—*e.g.*, the sentence quoted above from p. 33; also the expression on p. 54 "at its most vital." It is hardly probable that Dr. Gray would have let these pass if he had himself prepared the MS. for press, and the editor might well have made some necessary alterations in such passages.

S. C. Gayford.

Some Postulates of a Christian Philosophy. By H. Maurice Relton, D.D. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

We congratulate the venerable S.P.C.K. upon the serious attempt which it has been making of late to deal adequately, impartially, and from diverse theological and philosophical standpoints, with the religious difficulties of the age. The outstanding volume, *Science Religion and Reality*, of which the interest is mainly scientific, and which has proved to be all the more truly apologetic in result because it was so obviously not apologetic in intention, has been followed by two others dealing from the religious standpoint with certain leading problems of modern philosophy—viz., *Faith and Truth*, by F. H. Brabant and Percy Hartill, a well-informed and lucidly written work, whose merits must not be estimated by its size, and the present volume of Dr. Relton.

Although both books are written from the definitely Anglo-Catholic standpoint, they differ considerably in philosophical outlook. *Faith and Truth* continues the Idealist tradition of the *Lux Mundi* school, and has obviously been greatly influenced by the more positive side of the teaching of T. H. Green; whereas *Some Postulates* is definitely Aristotelian and Realist in tendency.

Dr. Relton's philosophical position has considerable affinities with that of the great Oxford teacher, Professor Cook Wilson, but it is obviously from Aquinas and the more liberal of the Neo-scholastics that he draws his chief inspiration. For example, he insists, with them, that the nature and attributes of God are so entirely unique that not even the fact of "being" or "existence" can be predicated of Him and of creatures in an identical sense. He also defends, mainly with the scholastic arguments, God's absolute perfection and self-sufficiency apart from the created universe; the entire freedom of the divine decree to create, which was inspired by pure benevolence, not enforced by any supposed need of self-expression on His part on the plane of the finite and temporal; also the difficult and much-criticised conception of creation *ex nihilo*. "Some of us are casting," he says, "wistful glances towards scholasticism, and wondering whether St. Thomas is not our true guide in the perplexities with which, as we have seen, our Christian thought is beset in the effort to come to terms with 'the modern mind.'"

Dr. Relton, however, is a liberal and at times even a critical follower of the scholastic school. He is thoroughly well read in recent philosophy, and, following the modern tendency, attributes considerably more weight to direct religious experience, as distinguished from logical reasoning, than St. Thomas himself or any of his modern followers—at least, in the Roman obedience—would approve. It is true that St. Thomas himself quite definitely recognized a sphere in religion *supra rationem*, but Dr. Relton, influenced by Bergson and other exponents of modern Irrationalism, exhibits a far greater distrust of the power of logical reasoning to grapple with the mysteries of the universe than scholastic philosophers in general. "Christian dogma," says Dr. Relton, "cannot be fully rationalized. The Incarnation and the Trinity [in spite of Hegel's attempts to rationalize them] remain 'mysterious.' . . . We must refuse to admit that the intellect alone is competent to 'sense' Reality. [But] our claim to what we call a sphere *supra rationem* is not an appeal so much to the irrational—with all its dangers to which we, no less than our critics, are fully alive—as to the 'larger reason' which faith has not inaptly been called. When we find a limit to the powers of the finite intellect in the effort to apprehend reality at a sensitive point, we have other resources—æsthetic, moral, spiritual—as well as intellectual powers, and when the human reason falters before the *mysterium tremendum*, the 'inner logic' of faith may carry us further. This appeal to faith, so far from being the abandonment of metaphysics, is rather an appeal to a 'larger reason' than the merely logical. Where Aristotelian rationalism falters, we claim a power of the

whole human personality in its tensest moments to apprehend in some direct intuitive way what escapes us by a process of reasoning. If it be said that this is an appeal against logic to mysticism . . . after all, we have the whole weight of religious experience on our side in the claim we are making for the 'larger reason' by which we seek to transcend the verdict given by mere ratiocination. The present reaction against 'the vice of intellectualism,' as evidenced by the immense influence Bergson is exercising, has been for some of us a trumpet-call to a larger freedom. . . . I find myself clinging with more confidence than ever to what Inge has called the 'logic of the whole personality' in the effort to penetrate more deeply into the world *supra rationem*, which is at once transcendent above and immanent in the lives of us finite-infinite spirits."

Personally, I should have much preferred Dr. Relton's book to have taken the form of a brief and closely reasoned philosophical treatise, like that of Mr. Brabant and Mr. Hartill; but the somewhat diffuse and homiletical style which he has adopted will probably be more acceptable to the majority of readers. The book is easily intelligible to the non-philosophical reader, and contains ample materials for several courses of sermons to educated congregations on modern religious problems and difficulties. We recommend our clerical readers to buy it and adapt it to the needs of their parishioners.

An important feature of Dr. Relton's work is his thoroughgoing and closely argued defence of the doctrine of the Two Natures of Christ as defined at Chalcedon. We wish that he would find time to expand his earlier essay, *A Study in Christology*, into a full treatise on the Incarnation, dealing exhaustively with the Christological discussions of the last twenty-five years. At present there is great need of a satisfactory treatise dealing with the present-day situation from the Catholic standpoint. Through lack of such a work, Dr. Mackintosh's *Doctrine of the Person of Christ* has come into extensive use in Anglican theological colleges, and is even prescribed by Bishops for their ordination examinations, in spite of the fact that it rejects with decision the Chalcedonian definition, and is critical even of that of Nicæa.

CHARLES HARRIS.

NOTICES

THE PASSING AND THE PERMANENT IN ST. PAUL. By H. Bulcock, M.A., B.D. Macmillan and Co. 10s. 6d.

Mr. Bulcock has the merit of realizing that to a very large extent the doctrinal system of St. Paul is an attempt to state in the current theological language of his time the central fact of his religious experience, the revolution in religious values wrought by the appearance of a supreme revelation in the person of our Lord. Exactly why he should have thought so is not quite clear in view of the very reduced Christology which Mr. Bulcock seems prepared to accept. He has the further merit of realizing the impossibility of expecting St. Paul to be a consistent theologian. He claims the right to study the Pauline documents in such a way as to relate the thought of their author to eternal experience and our fullest conception of truth and value, not merely in order to discover his actual meaning. The claim is in itself legitimate, but it involves some measure of certainty as to what constitutes universal experience and our fullest conceptions of truth and value, if the result is to rise above the value of a propagandist tract or manifesto; and it is obviously impossible to make good any claim to certainty of this kind at the present day without a rather irritating assumption of personal infallibility. Further, it involves some measure of certainty as to the actual meaning of the Pauline writings in their historical setting at a moment when the whole subject is in the melting-pot. Mr. Bulcock does not seem to have devoted much independent research to this matter. Ramsay, Meyer, Bousset, Cumont, and Reitzenstein jostle one another on his pages. Josephus is not mentioned. Nor is there any attempt to establish a standard by which the often contradictory assertions of these and other authorities may be tested and the a priori bias which determines so much of their writing be discounted. The result is an arbitrary selection of the view which suits his purpose best as the assured truth, when in fact it is often a highly disputable assumption of a religious propagandist.

The style of the book is often trying. Such a sentence as "Thought about the universe must be antinomious" (p. 142) goes beyond human endurance.

W. L. KNOX.

VERS LA FOI CATHOLIQUE. Vol. II. Jesus devant la critique, son existence, sa mission, sa personalité. L'Abbé Paul Buysse. Beyaert, Bruges.

This second volume of the Abbé Buysse is a monument of patient, logical, and devout apologetic. His former volume, *L'Eglise de Jésus*, led him to a point where it was necessary to establish the supernatural character of the Church's Founder. He now begins at the beginning by dealing carefully and faithfully with those who have denied altogether the very existence of Jesus, and slowly develops his argument to the point where at last he can only bid his reader pray for faith: "Car . . . la foi n'est pas un dû, elle est un don."

It may seem sometimes that the Professor's hands are a little tied by his ecclesiastical allegiance. He maintains, as in duty bound, the priority of St. Matthew to St. Mark, and he seems to assume that only "rationalists" hold the Two-Document theory of the sources of the Synoptists.

He classes together "Anglicans" and "Conservative Protestants" as those whose belief is nearest to Catholicism. But apparently he thinks that Dr. Gore is exceptional in accepting the definitions of Ephesus and Chalcedon, and that all Anglicans are Kenotists, if no worse. Yet he quotes with approval Illingworth's saying that "Jesus, in spite of His evident humanity, seems to be at home in both worlds, the divine and the human."

The Abbé has read widely among many authors, orthodox and heretical, and marshals the results of his study with a masterly hand. Long and intricate as his treatment is, there is hardly a sentence which has not its own part in the development of three great theses: the personal existence of Jesus, His Messianic Mission, and His Divinity.

K. D. Mackenzie.

The Life of St. Francis de Sales. Vol. I. By the Rev. Harold Burton. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 15s. net.

St. Francis de Sales is the patron saint of Catholic journalists and, in the words of the present Pope, all those who through the publication of journals or of other writings promote and defend the Christian doctrine. In the Anglican Church there exists a guild for journalists which is dedicated to him, and it is much to be desired that in all their apologetic and controversial writings they should maintain that combination of vigour, moderation, and charity which is characteristic of Francis.

Few lives have been so full as that of St. Francis de Sales. He was born in 1567, when the Reformation was in full blast in the North and West of Europe, and he was emphatically a man of his age. He was a great apostle of Catholicism, toiling without intermission, and without fear, to convince and convert Protestants of all classes in those districts of Savoy which were nearest to Geneva. (He was made Bishop of this place at the age of thirty-five.) He found time, however, amid these missionary activities, for real scholarship and for deep thought; he is the only "Doctor of the Church" among the great figures of the counter-Reformation. And his own interior life was rich, devout, and austere, rooted in his daily Mass and in private meditation, and bearing fruit in fearless and careless self-sacrifice. It is not by accident that his *Introduction to the Devout Life* is a classic of spiritual direction. He is not a master of a compromising casuistry; rather has he learned the needs of the pilgrim soul in his own difficult and dangerous struggles to live the Catholic life among manifold temptations and trials.

The material for a biography of St. Francis is both detailed and complete. We know, or we can know if we will, what he did month by month, and sometimes day by day. The greater part of the present volume is concerned with the first thirty-five years of his life, before he was raised to the episcopate. It shows him enduring terrible hardships, and constantly risking his life, to minister to Catholics and to try to convince Protestants. As a bishop, he journeys constantly through his diocese, preaching, hearing confessions, busy with the oversight of the faithful. Fr. Burton deals at considerable length with two books written by the Saint, *The Controversies*, and the better-known *Introduction to the Devout Life*. Indeed, this is a workmanlike book, and we shall look forward to the second volume with keen interest.

A. E. Baker.

PROPHECY AND ESCHATOLOGY. By Nathaniel Micklem, M.A. pp. 248. George Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

For a number of years Professor Micklem has been known to the Christian public as an interesting and stimulating writer on questions of practical religion, but we believe that this is the first time that he has ventured on the straiter path of advanced scholarship. The book shows us that we have in our midst a scholar who is well acquainted with the literature of his subject—his references to other writers are conclusive on this point—who is himself possessed of sound learning, and who exhibits a very keen critical mind.

The purpose of the book is to attempt an estimate of the extent to which the great prophets of Israel (down to and including Ezekiel) adopted and proclaimed truly eschatological views, and to this is prefixed a chapter on the prophetic psychology. The reader will gather that Professor Micklem himself finds little or no reason to believe that there is any real eschatology to be found even as a background to the prophetic thinking. But the greater part of his work is frankly controversial. Hölscher, Gunkel, Sellin, Gressmann, Skinner, Lofthouse—to say nothing of lesser writers—are cited repeatedly, and as a rule cited in order to be refuted. Box and Gray alone are normally quoted with approval. It is, perhaps, unfortunate that the book should give this impression, for, as Professor Micklem insists, he has learnt a great deal from his predecessors, and agrees with them in a very large measure, and it is only natural that where he has been led to a conclusion in which he stands nearly alone, he should need to quote mainly the positions which he finds himself unable to accept.

But if the book gives the impression that its author is temperamentally a controversialist (and the impression may be quite false), it must be admitted at once that he is a model controversialist. He does not scorn his adversaries, nor does he misrepresent them. He shows a very keen, analytic mind, and whilst many of his views will need a good deal of careful consideration before they can receive serious assent, there are from time to time really illuminating suggestions. A good example is the interpretation of the name Shear-jasub as "a remnant shall *repent*." On the whole the book is thoroughly interesting and stimulating, and, like all Professor Micklem's work, brilliantly written. Professor Micklem may or may not have established his point, but he has certainly written an important book, which will be a useful addition to English literature on the prophets.

T. H. ROBINSON.

RELIGION AND NATURAL SCIENCE. By E. Haigh. S.C.M. 4s. 6d.

This book deals with the relation of Christianity to Natural Science, and is intended primarily for those seekers after truth who have no time to study more elaborate treatises. This purpose it fulfils excellently. After a chapter "mainly about definitions," it proceeds to deal with Natural Science and Religion ("an educated religious man cannot be wholly indifferent to scientific knowledge"), and with Natural Science and the Bible ("the Bible is not infallible in details of history or in Natural Science"). The author then discusses the "conflict of Natural Science and Religion," which, he considers, is diminishing in intensity. Theologians are more candid and scientists less dogmatic than formerly. The chapters which follow on Evolution and the New Psychology are helpful

and suggestive. Most readers will turn with special interest to the section on Religious Difficulties. Many of these are artificially created. Others cannot be completely solved. But we must patiently "follow the gleam," and so we shall be led to a fuller realization of the truth. The concluding chapters deal with Nature rather than with Natural Science. Nature is the thought of God expressed in things visible. It is a divine revelation, but it is only partial. It leads us into the outer court of the Temple. Beyond this lies the Holy of Holies.

A brief bibliography at the end of each chapter adds to the value of a most useful book.

H. W. FULFORD.

THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC REVIVAL. By S. L. Ollard. Mowbray. 3s. 6d.

This is a popular account of the Revival—the substance of six lectures delivered during Lent, 1925, at All Saints', Margaret Street. Canon Ollard has done his work supremely well. He covers a great deal of ground, he introduces us to many characters, and yet we never lose sight of the wood for the trees. He makes the heroes of that time live again for us: and he tells us clearly for what they fought, and how much they won. We to-day have entered into their labours. He insists that the Movement was a Revival and not a new thing. The men who strove for Catholic truth then were the heirs of great men of an older generation—Andrewes, Laud, the non-Jurors and Nicholas Ferrar, the pioneer of the Religious Life. Canon Ollard does full justice to the share of Cambridge in the Revival, which Hugh James Rose started by his Hulsean Lectures in 1826. Soon after followed Keble's Assize Sermon in 1833, and thereafter the movement grew at Oxford and spread all over the country, in spite of bitter hostility and hate. We may admit that at Oxford there was some small justification for persecution. Hurrell Froude's *Remains*, W. E. Ward's *Ideal Church*, and Tracts 80 and 90 may well have alarmed Oxford Conservatives. But for the shameful scenes at St. George's-in-the-East and the mob-violence suffered by J. M. Neale—to take only two instances—there could be no excuse. It is good to be reminded of these things in our more peaceful days. Anglo-Catholics of to-day may well take both courage and warning from the earlier history of the Movement. The confessors of those days fought for great principles, and they fought under great leadership. They were not primarily concerned with questions of ritual and ceremonial. What they contended for was "the supreme fact that in the Church of England," as a living part of the Church Catholic, "there were present in all their fullness the gifts of the Spirit and the power of the Lord."

H. W. FULFORD.

BOOK NOTES

Confirmation Instructions. By the Rev. Charles Paterson Smyth, M.A. Hodder and Stoughton. 2s. 6d. This is a competent book, which should be useful to young priests who have to take confirmation classes for children. The chapter on impurity is particularly good, if sex-teaching is to be given to a class at all. There is much to be said for the view that it can only be concrete and definite if it is given privately to individuals.

A Philosophy from Prison. A Study of the Epistle to the Ephesians. By F. R. Barry, D.S.O., M.A. S.C.M. 4s. or 2s. 6d. A commentary by

a well-known Anglican writer, intended for the sixth form of schools, and the non-theological members of the Student Movement. It deals with the text under the three general heads of God in History, Christ the Meaning of History, and Self-expression and Social Life. Professor Barry is a very fresh and stimulating writer. At times one has a slight suspicion that he is recording what he has read *into* St. Paul, rather than what he has read *in* him. But the book is none the worse for that, for all religion must be subjective *and* objective.

The Last Supper and Calvary. By the Rev. Alfred Swaby, O.P. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s. net. The late Fr. Swaby made the scientific study of the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass his chief way of devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. This small posthumous work is a most valuable examination of three points in particular, the essence of the eucharistic sacrifice, the absoluteness of the Cross, and the oneness of the Mass with the Cross. Fr. Swaby takes the view, most ably supported by Fr. Vincent McNabb in a valuable introduction, that our Lord's Passion (from the Garden to the Cross) was in an absolute sense His Sacrifice of Himself for the redemption of the world; this is in opposition to a view held by some modern Roman writers that the Last Supper was an essential part of the Sacrifice. Those who seek clear thinking and precision of statement on such subjects should certainly read this book.

The Elements of Ethics. By Charles C. Miltner, C.S.C., Ph.D. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 7s. 6d. This is a textbook of Scholastic Ethics for beginners. The first half deals with General Ethics, the second with the application of principles to such particular problems as the State, the Family, and Education. There is certainly not a glut of simple books on Catholic Ethics; this one contains useful hints about further reading, and an important feature is a list of *Study Questions* at the end of each chapter.

Vie et Lettres de Sœur Emilie. 1. Vie. Par le P. Victor Couty, S.J. Louvain. E. Desbarax. 6 fr. This is an important human document. Sister Emilie (Julie Schneider) was Superior of a house of the "Filles de la Croix" in Düsseldorf. She gave to our Lord an offering which combined the service of Martha and the service of Mary. She was Superior of a House during the time that a most difficult and complicated reform was carried out. At the same time her practice of the contemplative life was full and unrestrained. The author of this Life calls her "une âme mystique au temps présent." Her mystical experiences were recorded in letters to her confessor, and we are promised a selection of these in a further volume. The quotations from her letters given in the Life show that she is really important for the understanding of mysticism. We recommend all students of the subject, those who suspect mysticism as dangerous as well as those who are attracted by it, to study the Life of Sister Emilie. She reminds one of St. Catherine of Genoa.

A useful complement to this book is *The Burning Bush*, by Dom S. Louismet, O.S.B. (Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s. 6d. net), a treatise on the ecstatic contemplation of the Blessed Trinity. It is the seventh of a series of eight volumes which Dom Louismet has written on traditional mysticism. Whereas Sister Emilie lays great emphasis on the passive aspect of mysticism—the word *ravie* occurs often in her letters—this book says much of human initiative. The book is divided into three sections, God in Himself, God in Creation, and God in the soul of the mystic. Its fault is a straining after logical symmetry and a formal orthodoxy. But we have found it interesting.

Portraits of Men of the New Testament. By the late Rev. Thomas E. Miller, M.A. Allenson. 5s. This volume completes the series of addresses on Men and Women of the Bible which the late minister of the Gillespie United Free Church, Dunfermline, delivered to his congregation. It covers people about whom we know much, like St. Paul and St. John the Baptist, and men about whom we know little, like Apollos. The author's scholarship was not strikingly up-to-date, nor was his point of view unusual. There is no word, for example, about the relation of St. Paul to Stoicism or the Mysteries, nor of the importance of our Lord's baptism by St. John for the theology of the sacraments. The book has an irritating habit of referring to "Paul" or "Luke"; one feels tempted to say, "*Saint* Paul to you, sir!"

Meditations on Various Aspects of the Spiritual Life. By the Sadhu Sundar Singh. Macmillan. 2s. 6d. net. This little book has an enthusiastic introduction by the Bishop of London. Its author is well known as a Christocentric mystic of real originality, recalling the "shewings" of Lady Julian of Norwich. Since his earlier writings, he shows more traces of the influence of European writers, especially of the Catholic mystics. In our judgment, his work is not improved by this dependence. His strength still lies in the vivid little parables from his own experience with which he barbs his teaching. A. E. B.

Pilgrimage Papers: Some Impressions of the Anglo-Catholic Pilgrimage to the Holy Land, 1924. W. M. Bull. Preface by P. N. Waggett. S.S.J.E. Mowbray. 2s. 6d. This little book is a reprint of articles contributed to the *All Saints Parish Paper.* It is helped by Fr. Waggett's appreciative preface and some rather interesting illustrations. To some minds it will vividly recall their happy experiences in the Holy Land.

The Blind Obedience of an Humble Penitent. The Best Cure for Scruples. By Sylvester Jenks, with Introduction by Dom Roger Hudleston, Monk of Downside Abbey. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 5s. and 2s. 6d. The author of this delightful little work was one of the priests sent from Douay to this country in the latter part of the seventeenth century, his ministry coinciding with the reigns of James II., William III., and Anne. Its object is to cure scrupulosity and to inculcate complete confidence in the judgment of the Confessor. The weapon most relied upon is quiet ridicule. The reader's pleasure in the book is enhanced by beautiful binding and printing.

The Secret of Progress by Rule and Method in the Spiritual Life. By T. J. Hardy. Mowbray. 4s. 6d. The greater part of this book consists of a valuable and straightforward plea, the object of which is adequately described by the title. In the chapter on "How to Gain Control" Mr. Hardy breaks newer ground, and what he has to say is able, interesting, and well worth reading, though it may be permitted to doubt whether we are compelled by modern psychology to abandon the whole conception of the will as completely as he seems to urge. In regard to "the Sunday question," the author seems rather obsessed by fear of the teaching that "Sunday is sufficiently observed by an act of Communion at seven or eight o'clock." One is at a loss to know which are the "many pulpits" in which statements so wild can be made, or where are the "many parishes" in which Sunday Evening prayer is displaced in favour of "Vespers with Special Devotions." K. D. M.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER